Vol. 8 | 1932 | Nos. 1 & 2

JOURNAL

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

(New Series)

EDITED BY

Dr. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, M.A., PH.D. (Berlin)

A. A. A. FYZEE, M.A. (Cantab.), Bar-at-Law

Prof. N. K. BHAGWAT, M.A.

CONTENTS

Published by the Society
September 1932.

London Agent:

ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN
41, Great Russell Street, London, W.C., 1

THE TIMES OF INDIA PRESS, BOMBAY

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

Royal Asiatic Society.

MANAGING COMMITTEE.

President :

SIR GOVIND DINANATH MADGAONKAR, KT., I.C.S. (Rtd.).

Vice-Presidents :

P. V. KANE, Esq., M.A., LL.M.

Principal J. MCKENZIE, M.A.

V. P. VAIDYA, Esq., B.A., Bar-at-Law.

The Hon. Mr. JUSTICE B. J. WADIA, Bar-at-Law.

Honorary Secretary :

J. S. TILLEY, Esq.

Honorary Financial Secretary :

B. K. WAGLE, Esq., B.A. (Cantab.)

Members :

G. V. ACHARYA, Esq., B.A.
M. D. ALTEKAR, Esq., M.A.
S. V. BHANDARKAR, Esq., B.A., LL.B.
Prof. R. D. CHOKSI, M.A.
A. FORRINGTON, Esq.
A. A. A. FYZEE, Esq., M.A. (Cantab.), LL.B., Bar-at-Law.
Prof. V. A. GADGIL, M.A.
Prof. A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, M.A.
G. S. GHURYE, Esq., M.A., PH.D.
Rev. Fr. H. HERAS, S.J.
DEWAN BAHADUR KRISHNALAL MOHANLAL JHAVERI, M.A., LL.B.
R. P. MASANI, Esq., M.A.
A. MASTER, Esq., C.I.E., I.C.S.
Sir JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI, KT., C.I.E., LL.D.
C. A. MUCHHALA, Esq.
Dr. M. B. REHMAN, M.A., PH.D.
Prof. C. R. SHAH, M.A.
Prof. H. D. VELANKAR, M.A.
Prof. P. A. WADIA, M.A.

JOURNAL

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

(New Series)

EDITED BY

Dr. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, M.A., PH.D. (Berlin).
A. A. A. FYZEE, M.A. (Cantab.), Bar-at-Law.
Prof. N. K. BHAGWAT, M.A.

VOLUME 8

1932

Published by the Society
September 1932

London Agent:
ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN
41, Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1

THE TIMES OF INDIA PRESS, BOMBAY

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

New Series, Vol. 8, 1932.

ARTICLES.

BRIEF NOTES.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

JOURNAL

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

VOL. 8 1932 NOS. 1 & 2

VṚTTAJĀTISAMUCCAYA OF VIRAHĀṄKA

(A TREATISE ON PRAKRIT METRES.)

(CHAPTERS V—VI.)

BY PROF. H. D. VELANKAR.

(*Continued from Vol. V, p.* 94.)

INTRODUCTION.

In my last article on the subject which appeared in Volume 5 I had given only the first four chapters of Virahāṅka's work. Here I propose to give the remaining two chapters. Some of the missing folios containing the commentary on these chapters have been found, and this helped me a great deal in restoring the text of this rare work.

In the fifth chapter of this work, the author defines 52 metres generally employed by Sanskrit writers. He uses the Sanskrit language in defining these probably meaning thereby that these metres are used in Sanskrit as a rule. Compare the definition of the metre called Sāmyā (IV. 23) and the note containing the commentator's remark on it.

Among the metres that are defined here, it is remarkable that our author does not mention any Ardhasama or Viṣama metres. Even among the Prakrit metres, he mentions only a few Ardhasama metres, but does not classify them under a separate heading except in the case of the Dvipadīs (cf. III 47-54 ; IV. 18 ; 48-50 ; 66 ; 81 ;

84 ; 104). As regards the Viṣama Vṛttas, he evidently knows only the solitary Catuṣpada (cf. IV. 69). That he did not regard the Ardhasama and Viṣama Vṛttas as separate divisions is also evident from the fact that in describing the six Pratyayas, he never once mentions how to do these in the case of the Ardhasama and Viṣama Vṛttas as is done for example, by Hemacandra.

Another curious thing about these definitions is that they do not contain a reference anywhere to the Yati, *i.e.*, the Cæsura in the body of a line. It is probable that our author did not accept the theory of Yati. In his opinion, the Yati seems to be merely a matter of convenience even in the Sanskrit metres as it is in the Prakrit ones. The commentator of Kavidarpaṇa (a work on Prakrit metres written about the 12th century A. D. and which I soon intend to publish along with Nanditāḍhya and Chandakośa of Ratnaśekhara) quotes a stanza of Svayambhū (obviously a writer on Prakrit metres, to whom a reference is also found in the Avacūri on Nanditāḍhya) in this connection. According to it, Jayadeva and Piṅgala alone accept the theory of Yati in Sanskrit metres, while Māṇḍavya, Bharata, Kāśyapa, Saitava and others do not accept it. Our author probably belonged to the latter school. Hemacandra knew all these writers as is obvious from his reference to them. Our author also seems to have known them. He mentions Piṅgala (I. 1 ; VI. 1) and Māṇḍavya (VI. 1) by name. As regards Kāśyapa and Jayadeva, he seems to have known them since he gives the names Siṁhonnata (v. 31) and Narkuṭaka (v. 38) to the metres usually known as Vasantatilaka and Avitatha. Now the names Siṅhākrānta and Narkuṭaka were first given to these metres by Kāśyapa and Jayadeva respectively as Hemacandra (p. 10a, line 9 and p. 13a, line 2) tells us. It is not improbable that our author copied the names from these writers.

One more thing which attracts our notice in Virahāṅka's treatment of Sanskrit metres is that he does not use the eight Akṣara Gaṇas in defining them. He sticks to the terms mentioned by him at I. 17-33. Naturally the definition is not finished in a Pāda of the defined metre as is usually done by other writers ; but the whole metre is employed for this purpose which naturally

tries the patience of the reader to the utmost. Long compounds and meaningless adjectives are used to fill up the gaps. This strange procedure leads us to assume either that Virahāṅka did not know the Akṣara Gaṇas—which is highly improbable though Virahāṅka does not actually mention them anywhere—or that he purposely employed the whole metres and not merely a Pāda for defining them. Generally whole stanzas are employed for defining Prakrit metres ; Virhāṅka merely extended this method to the Sanskrit metres, even at the cost of brevity. One is, however, unable to understand his purpose in doing this.

The name Miśrā (v. 21) given to the Upajāti metre is significant. The other name Saikatripādā given to the same metre appears to suggest that an Upajāti stanza usually contained *one* line of either Indravajrā or Upendravajrā and *three* of the other. Though Virahāṅka does not arrange the Sanskrit metres under 26 heads beginning with Uktā and ending with Utkṛti still this division which is based on the number of letters in a Pāda, was certainly known to him as is clear from the order in which the metres are arranged and also from his reference to Bṛhatī (VI. 16) and Utkṛti (VI. 17 ; 44, &c.)

In the sixth or the last chapter, the author proceeds to describe the six " proofs " (modification is not the correct translation of Pratyaya) as promised at I. 12. These are :—(1) Prastāra, (2) Naṣṭa, (3) Uddiṣṭa, (4) Laghukriyā, (5) Saṅkhyā and (6) Adhvā. Among these, the first or the Prastāra is of various kinds ; our author describes eight different varieties of it, namely (1) Sūcī, (2) Meru, (3) Patākā, (4) Samudra, (5) Viparītasamudra, (6) Pātāla, (7) Śālmali and (8) Viparītaśālmali.

Sūci. (*Vv.* 5-7.) The first of these, *i.e.*, the *Sūci* consists in putting down the numeral 1 as many times as there are letters in a Pāda of a given metre and once more (v. 5*a*) and adding the first to the second, the second to the third, the third to the fourth and so on, leaving the last figure every time (v. 6b) in the process of addition. The process is to be repeated until the second figure becomes the last one (v. 7a) and is left out in the addition. Thus in the case of a metre with five letters in a Pāda, put down the numeral 1 six times

(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) and go on adding as directed above. We get then I (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1); II (1, 3, 6, 10, 5, 1) ; III (1, 4, 10, 10, 5, 1) ; IV (1, 5, 10, 10, 5, 1) respectively. The last is the Sūcī and the figures in it respectively represent the number of permutations (Prastārapātagaṇanā) of the above metre containing (1) no short letter or all long letters, (2) one short letter, (3) two short letters, (4) three short letters, (5) four short letters and (6) five or all short letters. Again the total of the different figures naturally represents the Saṅkhyā, *i.e.*, the total number of all the possible permutations of the metre. In the present case it is 32. Hemacandra describes the process at p. 48b, line 16 ff. without giving the name Sūcī Prastāra to it.

Meru. (*Vv.* 8-10.)

The second or the *Meru Prastāra* is nothing but a collection of the Sūcī Prastāras of metres containing from 1 to 26 letters in a Pāda, arranged one below the other in rising succession. Its purpose is the same as that of the Sūcī. The actual process, however, slightly differs. It is as follows :—Write two small squares in the first line, three in the second, four in the third and so on adding one square in each subsequent line (v. 8a). Write the numeral 1 in each of the two squares in the first line : thereafter write the same in the *first* and the *last* squares in each line (v. 8b). In each of the middle squares write the number which is obtained by adding together the numbers in the two squares just above it in the upper line (v. 9a ; the squares in the lower line are to be so placed as to be midway between the two squares in the upper line). The resulting figures will be the Sūcī Prastāras of the different metres containing from 2 to 26 letters as said above ; cf. Prākṛta Piṅgala (N.S.P. ed.) I. 40.

Patākā. (*Vv.* 11-12.)

The third or the *Patākā Prastāra* is intended for showing the structure of all the different permutations of a metre. It is to be arranged in as many vertical lines as there are letters in the Pāda of a given metre. Thus there will be three vertical lines for a metre with three letters in a Pāda. In the first of these lines, long (s) and short (i) letters should be arranged in succession (Maṇiravamālākāro). The total number of these letters is

to be determined in the following way:—In the case of a metre having only *one* letter in a Pāda it will be 2; now this number should be doubled for each additional letter in a Pāda. Thus for a metre with two letters in a Pāda it will be 4; for a metre with three it will be 8; for one with four letters it will be 16 and so on (Viuṇe Viuṇehi Vaḍḍhio Kamaso). The number of long and short letters following each other in succession in the *first* line is thus fixed. The same number of letters is contained in each of the other lines but the manner in which the long and short letters follow each other differs, the rule being that the number of long letters in succession followed by an equal number of short letters in succession for each succeeding line is double the number of those in each previous line (Viuṇe Viuṇehi Vaḍḍhio Kamaso). Thus in the first line there is only *one* long letter followed by *one* short letter. In the second, there will be *two* long letters followed by *two* short letters in succession. In the third there will be *four* and in the fourth there will be *eight* long letters in succession followed by an equal number of short letters in succession and so on, the number of the vertical lines being determined as said above, by the number of letters in a Pāda of the given metre. In each case, half the letters in the last line will be long in succession and will be followed by an equal number of short letters in succession (Ṇihaṇaddhamaṇī Ravaddho ya).

Samudra. (*Vv.* 13-20.)

The fourth or the *Samudra Prastāra* is in form exactly like the *Patākā* and is intended for the same purpose. But the process by which it is done slightly differs. Here the Prastāra is arranged in *horizontal* and not vertical lines. In the first line put down as many long letters as there are letters in a Pāda of a given metre (Jahicchāe). Then in the second, place a short letter under the *first long* letter (Paḍhamacamara) in the upper line and then copy down the letters as they are in the upper line. Follow the same process in the subsequent lines until we get all short letters (Farisā savve) in the last line. Only, when there are short letters *preceding* (Magge) the *first long* letter in the upper line, we should write all long letters under these, in the lower line (v. 14b). Both these Prastāras are explained by Hemacandra without giving the

names at p. 46b, line 6 ff and p. 47b, line 9 ff. This same method is to be followed for doing the Prastāra for Mātrā Vṛttas, but where by following the process, the required number of Mātrās is not obtained in a particular Gaṇa, one short letter (I) should be added at the beginning (v. 18b) and thus the number of Mātrās be completed. This extra Mātrā is of course to be disregarded in the process, *i.e.*, no long letter is to be written under it in the next lower line. Only in the case of the uneven Gaṇas of a Gāthā (v. 19) this extra short letter is to be placed under the *last long* letter (Antacamatra) of the Gaṇa in the upper line and not at the beginning as said above, thus avoiding the Narendra (ISI) group which is forbidden in these Gaṇas (v. 20a). Again, in the case of Gaṇas containing an odd number of Mātrās, *i.e.*, 5, 7, etc., (Viṣamamattāṇa), the first permutation should have the first letter short (v. 20b) and the rest long ones. Cf. also, Hemacandra, p. 47b, line 8 ff.

Viparīta-samudra. (*V.* 21.)

The fifth or the *Viparītasamudra* is just the opposite of the last variety. In it, the process of the *Samudra* is to be reversed. In the first line we have all short letters. Then in each succeeding line a long letter should be written under the *first* short letter (Paḍhmaravāho) in the upper line and the rest should be copied as they are in the upper line. Under the letters which precede the *first* short letter in the upper line, however, we should write all short letters (Maggathiāvi farisā) in the lower line and go on in this manner until we get all long letters in the last line.

Pātāla. (*Vv.* 22-23.)

The sixth or the *Pātāla Prastāra* consists of five figures respectively representing (1) the total number of permutations of the metre; (2) the total number of letters contained in these permutations; (3) the total number of Mātrās contained in them; (4) the total number of short letters in them and (5) the total number of long letters in them (v. 23b). Of these figures the first is obtained from the Sūcī Prastāra; the second is obtained by multiplying the first by the number of letters in a Pāda (Pāaṅka) of the given metre. The fourth and the fifth figures are obtained by halving the second, and the third is obtained by tripling the fourth or the fifth

(vv. 22b; 23a). Thus the Pātāla Prastāra of a metre with three letters in a Pāda would be :—8, 24, 36, 12, 12.

Śālmali. (*Vv.* 24-27*a.*)

The seventh or the *Śālmali Prastāra* consists of several lines, each containing three figures, which represent the number of short letters, the total number of letters and the number of long letters in order, contained in each of the different varieties or permutations of a Mātrāvṛtta. In the text, the author explains the Śālmali of a Gāthā. In the first line which represents the first permutation of a Gāthā, are given the smallest number of short letters and the largest number of long ones contained in it. They are 3 and 27. Thus in the first line of the Śālmali of a Gāthā the three figures will be 3, 30, 27. In each of the succeeding lines which represent the other succeeding permutations of a Gāthā, the first heap shall increase by 2, the second by 1 and the third shall decrease by 1, (vv. 24b, 25a). The figures in the second line will thus be 5, 31, 26; those in the third will be 7, 32, 25 and so on, until the last figure is 2 (Doccia Ṇihaṇe), *i.e.*, in 53, 55, 2.

Viparīta-śālmali. (*Vv.* 27*b*-28.)

The eighth or the *Viparītaśālmali* is the opposite of the last. Here the three figures in a line respectively represent the number of short letters, the total number of letters and the number of long letters in each permutation. Only, in the first line we have the *largest* number of short letters and the *smallest* number of long ones. Thus we have 53, 55, 2 in the first line. Then in each of the subsequent lines, the first heap shall decrease by 2, the second by 1 and the third shall increase by 1, so that the last line of the Viparītaśālmali of a Gāthā shall be equal to the first line of the Śālmali and *vice versa*.

Out of these eight kinds of Prastāra, only three, namely, Patākā, Samudra and Viparītasamudra are concerned with the different forms which a metre with a given number of letters or Mātrās may assume. The remaining five are intended for ascertaining the different numbers connected with these forms, *e.g.*, the number of short and long letters, the number of total Mātrās, the total number of the permutations of a metre, etc. Prastāra literally means 'spreading out', and usually the term is under-

stood as referring to the "spreading out" of the various forms which a metre may assume. This is how Hemacandra understands the word. According to this connotation only the three kinds mentioned above may be regarded as proper Prastāras. But our author seems to have understood the word a little differently. Prastāra according to him is (1) the spreading out of the various *forms* of a metre, as also (2) the spreading out of the *figures* so as to arrive at the number of short and long letters etc., in these forms. (The word is of course used also in the sense of '*one* of the various forms of a metre,' but this meaning is obviously connected with No. (1) and is only an extension or rather a restriction of it). Virahāṅka, however, seems to have forgotten that according to this connotation of the word, the Prastāra includes Laghukriyā and Saṅkhyā and the sixfold division of Pratyaya becomes overlapping. Accordingly when Virahāṅka comes to treat of Laghukriyā and Saṅkhyā, he finds that the subject has already been treated under Prastāra and so he only gives additional methods of doing the Laghukriyā and Saṅkhyā.

Hemacandra, on the other hand, took the word in the first of the two senses mentioned above, and therefore under Prastāra, he describes only the two, namely, Patākā and Samudra without of course, giving the names. The third, *i.e.*, Viparītasamudra is not an important variety, being merely the reverse of Samudra, and hence was neglected by him. Of the remaining five which are concerned with figures, he describes only the Sūcī under the Laghukriyā. Here, too, he does not mention the name. As for Piṅgala, he mentions Meru and Patākā but does not call them Prastāras. His Meru is meant for knowing the *total number* of the permutations of a given metre containing one or more short or long letters, while from his Patākā the *Serial Number* of these permutations is ascertained. Piṅgala gives two varieties each of Meru and Patākā:—(1) Varṇameru and (2) Mātrāmeru; (1) Varṇapatākā and (2) Mātrāpatākā. Virahāṅka's Meru agrees with Piṅgala's Varṇameru but the Patākā of the former is entirely different from that of the latter. Piṅgala again does not use the word Pratyaya though he seems to know the term Prastāra used in the sense of a 'permutation' (cf. I. 50). Hemacandra knows both the terms and his division of the Pratyayas

is more scientific than that of Virahāṅka as seen above. If we are permitted to assume that the present form of the Prākṛta Piṅgala Sūtra is but an amplification of an older work we may perhaps remark that the treatment of Piṅgala, Virahāṅka and Hemacandra roughly represents the three successive stages in the development of Prakrit Metrics.

Naṣṭa and Uddiṣṭa. (*Vv.* 29-39.)

Of the remaining Pratyayas, the second is the *Naṣṭa.* Its purpose is to find out the unknown (Naṣṭa) structure (Vṛtta) (v. 29a) of a particular permutation of a metre, the serial number (Aṅka) of this permutation being given. As opposed to this, in the third Pratyaya, *i.e.*, the *Uddiṣṭa*, the structure of a particular permutation is given and we are to find out its serial number (Kaammi Ṭhāṇammi) among the permutations of that metre. The terms Naṣṭa and Uddiṣṭa are used with reference to the structure of a permutation and not its serial number. To find out the unknown structure or form of a permutation when its serial number is given, we should write down in the first place, *a long letter* (s) *if this given number be an odd* figure and a short one (I) if it be *even* (v. 30 a). Then halve the given number further and further every time writing down a long or short letter according as the number obtained by halving is odd or even (v. 30a). The process should be continued until we obtain the required number of letters. The letters obtained in this manner represent the required structure. In the process of halving, 1 should be added to an odd number to obtain an equal division (v. 31a). When the division reaches the figure 1 (Naṭṭhaṅke), *all the remaining letters* should be written down long (Kaḍaāi) and this is obvious; cf. Hemacandra p. 47b, line 12 ff.

Now, to find out the serial number of a permutation, the structure of which is given (Uddiṣṭa), take the *last* short letter (Antam farisam) *in the structure and double it*, counting it as equal to 1. Thus we get 2; this number then, should be further and further doubled for each letter which precedes this last short letter, always deducting 1 from the figure obtained by doubling when the letter is long (Ekkekkam Camaresum Muñcaha); when the letter is short, 1 should not be deducted. The final

figure which we get is the serial number required (v. 34).

The Naṣṭa and Uddiṣṭa explained above are those of the Varṇavṛttas. See the notes on vv. 38-39 for those of the Mātrāvṛttas. Also cf. Hemacandra p. 48b, line 1 ff. In stanzas 35-37 the author explains the Naṣṭa and Uddiṣṭa of Mātrāvṛttas but it is with reference to the letters contained in them. He explains how to find out the unknown (Naṣṭa) number of letters when the serial number of the permutation of a Gāthā is given, and *vice versa*. See notes for the method. What is striking, however, is that here the terms Naṣṭa and Uddiṣṭa refer to the *Varṇasaṅkhyā* and not to the *Vṛttarūpa* as they usually do.

Laghukriyā. (*Vv.* 40-41.)

The fourth Pratyaya is *Laghukriyā*. It is either a process to find out the number of permutations containing a given number of short or long letters of a Vṛtta or a process to get the number of short and long letters in it. Virahāṅka under Laghukriyā, gives only the latter process (see notes), as he has given the former while treating of Sūcī and Meru Prastāras (cf. Lahukiriā Lambhae Saṅkhā—VI. 9). Hemacandra (p. 48b) gives only one, *i.e.*, the former, and in this connection he explains what Virahāṅka calls the Sūcī Prastāra.

Saṅkhyā. (*Vv.* 42-49.)

The fifth Pratyaya is *Saṅkhyā*. This, too, as shown above (under Sūci; also cf. VI. 9) is already taught in the Prastāra. Here, therefore, the author gives only an additional method for getting the Saṅkhyā, *i.e.*, the total number of permutations of a metre. It is this :—The Saṅkhyā for a metre with 1 letter (Antimavaṇṇe) in a Pāda is 2 ; this is to be doubled continuously for each additional letter in a Pāda (v. 42). Thus the Saṅkhyā for a metre with 2 letters in a Pāda is 4 ; for a metre with three letters in a Pāda it is 8 and so on (v. 43). For Mātrāvṛttas, the rule is different. The Saṅkhyā for a metre with only 1 Mātrā is 1 ; that for a metre with 2 Mātrās is 2 ; that for a metre with 3 Mātrās is 3 ; hereafter, the Saṅkhyā for a metre with an additional Mātra is equal to the Saṅkhyā of the two preceding metres added together (v. 45). Thus the Saṅkhyā for a metre with 4 Mātrās is 2+3=5 ; that for a metre with 5 Mātrās is 3+5= 8 ; that for

a metre with 6 Mātrās is 5+8=13 and so on. In vv. 48-49, Virahāṅka gives another way of obtaining the Saṅkhyā for a Gāthā, for which see Hemacandra, p. 49b, line 5 ff, and the notes.

Adhvā. (*Vv.* 52-60.)

The sixth and the last Pratyaya is *Adhvā*. Adhvā is the way *i.e.*, the space occupied by the permutations of a metre. This is explained by Virahāṅka in the remaining stanzas of the chapter. In this connection he gives an interesting table of the measures of length. It is as follows :—4 Aṅgulas = 1 Rāma ; 3 Rāmas = 1 Vitasti ; 2 Vitastis = 1 Hasta ; 4 Hastas = 1 Dhanus ; 2000 Dhanus = 1 Krośa ; 8 Krośas = 1 Yojana. All these are well known except Rāma and Dhanus or Dhanuhkara. Rāma probably is the palm with extended fingers leaving out the thumb. This is still used by villagers for measuring ordinary length of things in Aṅgulas. Dhanuhkara is perhaps the stick of the bow.

As regards the space, one letter short or long requires in the opinion of Virahāṅka, one Aṅgula. Again the blank space to be left between two letters is also one Aṅgula. Thus two letters require three Aṅgulas which is approximately equal to two inches and a quarter. So much space for letters could not obviously have been allowed when they were written on either palm-leaf or birch-bark as the leaves are not very broad. But it could possibly be allowed when copper-plates or rocks or for ordinary purposes a wooden slate with dust spread over it served as the writing material. I do not surely intend to maintain that Virahāṅka lived at a time when birch-bark or palm-leaves were not generally used as writing material though this is not impossible. But the true explanation of this curious fact seems to be that Virahāṅka taught what he learnt from tradition which of course must have originated at a time when so much space was given to each letter or when writing was still rather rare.

It will be seen from a reference to the notes, that v. 50 and the first half of v. 56 were composed by the commentator and inserted into the text. V. 57 was also materially changed by him as it did not accord with facts.

अथ विरहाङ्ककृतः वृत्तजातिसमुच्चयः ।

V

गौ रत्नांशो ॥ १ ॥
मुक्तायुग्मं नौरित्युक्ता ॥ २ ॥
द्वे रत्ने वैदूर्यम् ॥ सा **नारी** । ज्ञातव्या ॥ ३ ॥
सपटहम् । मरकतम् ॥ प्रियतमे । **मृगवधूः** ॥ ४ ॥
नूपुरहस्तौ । रत्नविरामौ ॥ **अक्षरपङ्क्तिः** । नाम मृगाक्षि ॥ ५ ॥
कर्णं कुरु भद्रे । स्पर्शं सपताकम् ॥
अन्ते चमरं चेत् । बाले **तनुमध्या** ॥ ६ ॥
रत्ने नूपुरयुक्ते । भावश्चैव तु पश्चात् ॥
कर्णश्चेन्निधनस्थो । भद्रे सा **मदलेखा** ॥ ७ ॥
रसरवसहितम् । सपटहचमरम् ॥
शशिमुखि सुभगे । **हरिविलसितकम्** ॥ ८ ॥
आदौ कर्णौ नित्यं भद्रे । रत्ने तस्मात्पश्चात्कृत्वा ॥
अन्ते शुभ्रं मुक्तायुग्मम् । ज्ञेयं वृत्तं **विद्युन्माला** ॥ ९ ॥
रत्ने रसरवौ प्रिये । केयूरमपरं भवेत् ॥
रूपं सकटकं सदा । **श्यामा** सुतनु कीर्तिता ॥ १० ॥
नूपुरशङ्खनरेन्द्रान् । भामिनि पश्यसि यत्र ॥
रूपयुतं यदि कर्णम् । शोभन एष **वितानः** ॥ ११ ॥
चामरभावौ कटकौ । पश्यसि हस्तं दयिते ॥
यस्य च नित्यं ललितम् । **माणवकक्रीडितकम्** ॥ १२ ॥
पक्षिनाथवैजयन्ती । रूपहारमौक्तिकानि ॥
नीलनीरजाक्षि मुग्धे । **मालिनीति** नाम वृत्तम् ॥ १३ ॥
द्विजपटहचमरम् । कमलमुखि सुभगे ॥
तरलतरनयने । सुविकसित**कुसुमम्** ॥ १४ ॥
यस्याजौ सप्तमं रूपम् । समस्तेषु च पञ्चमम् ॥
पादेषु चमरं षष्ठम् । **श्लोकं** तं तु विनिर्दिशेत् ॥ १५ ॥
रसपटहनूपुराणि । कमलमुखि रूपभाञ्जि ।
निधनगतचारुकर्णा । बुधजनकृतात्र **गुर्वी** ॥ १६ ॥
रवपटहौ तनुसुभगे । शशिमुखि चामरसरसौ ॥
निधनगतं सुतनु करम् । **त्वरितगतिर्**भवति ततः ॥ १७ ॥

नूपुरशङ्खौ चामरयुक्तौ । पश्यसि कान्ते रत्नरवौ च ॥
यत्र सुरेभं नैधनसंस्थम् । सा किल भद्रे **चम्पकमाला** ॥ १८ ॥
ग्रैवेयकं रत्नपताकयुक्तम् ।
पादं च मुग्धे करभोरु कान्ते ॥
यस्या मणिं पश्यसि राजमानम् ।
सैरावतान्ता कथि**तेन्द्रवज्रा** ॥ १९ ॥
उपेन्द्रवज्रा ध्वजरूपहारैः ।
सचामरैः शङ्खनरेन्द्रकर्णैः ॥
शशाङ्कवक्त्रे सुखदा कवीनाम् ।
प्रभूतशास्त्रार्थविचक्षणानाम् ॥ २० ॥
या इन्द्रवज्रार्धसमानरूपम् ।
उपेन्द्रवज्रार्धमुपैति यस्याः ॥
मिश्रेति नाम्ना कविभिः प्रयुक्ता ।
सैकत्रिपादेत्यपरे वदन्ति ॥ २१ ॥
रत्ने कृत्वा चामरं चैव पश्चात् ।
कर्णं मुग्धे स्पर्शयुक्तं वरोरु ॥
भूयः कर्णं देवपीलुं (नागं?) च दद्यात् ।
छन्दस्यैका (षा) **शालिनी** नाम वृत्तम् ॥ २२ ॥
आदौ रत्नं शशिमुखि सुभगे ।
कर्णस्तस्माद्गुरतनु ललिते ॥
रत्नं भूयः पटहरवयुतम् ।
हस्तश्चान्ते **भ्रमरविलसितम्** ॥ २३ ॥
यत्र मणिं प्रथमं तु नियुक्तम् ।
स्पर्शरसौ कटकं च रसं च ॥
नूपुरभावयुतं यदि कर्णम् ।
पश्यसि भामिनि **दोधकवृत्तम्** ॥ २४ ॥
वैनतेयपटहौ यदि भद्रे ।
वीक्षसे च कटकं रवयुक्तम् ॥
वैजयन्तिचमरं च वरोरु ।
स्वागतेति कवयः प्रवदन्ति ॥ २५ ॥
मुखे तु राजा चमरो विभूषणम् ।
रवद्वयं चारु वरोरु दृश्यते ॥
सपारिहार्यं च यदि ध्वजद्वयम् ।
वदन्ति सभ्याः **सुवसन्तमञ्जरीम्** ॥ २६ ॥

रसनूपुरशङ्खनरेन्द्ररवम् ।
कटकं च वरोरु भवेत्तु यदा ॥
यदि गन्धयुगं चमरं च भवेत् ।
पठ **तोटक**वृत्तमिदं सुभगे ॥ २७ ॥
रसरवौ कटकं पुरतः सदा ।
करयुगं च ततः सरवो मणिः ॥
द्रुतविलम्बितहंसगति प्रिये ।
द्रुतविलम्बितवृत्तमिदं तदा ॥ २८ ॥
द्वे रत्ने चरणरवौ च यत्र बाले ।
रूपं मौक्तिकसहितं ध्वजश्च मुग्धे ॥
अन्तस्थः सुरपतिवारणश्च मत्तः ।
तद्वृत्तं किल सुभगे **मयूरपिच्छम्** ॥ २९ ॥
मुखे रवश्चमरविभूषितो ध्वजः ।
ततो रसो वरतनु शङ्खयोजितः ॥
विशांपतिं कुरु सुभगे सनूपुरम् ।
सदागतिं वदति जनो ध्वजाङ्किताम् ॥ ३० ॥
पीनोन्नतस्तनभरानतगात्रयष्टे ।
सिंहोन्नतां प्रकथयामि तवाहमद्य ॥
वृत्तं प्रिये श्रवणपार्थिवपाणियुग्मम् ।
देवेशवारणविरामनियुक्तपादम् ॥ ३१ ॥
रसपटहपताकाचामरैरुल्लसद्भिः ।
विहगपतिनिबद्धैर्निर्मलैः पद्मरागैः ॥
विरचितसुरनागैर्वीक्षसे यत्र पादान् ।
भवति तदिह मुग्धे **मालिनी**नाम वृत्तम् ॥ ३२ ॥
नूपुरभावयुग्मसहितं खगं सुपटहम् ।
रत्नसुशोभितं वरतनु क्रमेण चमरम् ॥
यत्र हि वीक्षसे नरपतिं सदा शशिमुखि ।
हस्तविरामकं **प्रमुदिता** भवेत्तु सुभगे ॥ ३३ ॥
कर्णौ भावौ भुजगसहितौ वैनतेयः सरत्नो ।
बाले रूपं मरकतमथो हारमिन्दीवराक्षि ।
पादे यस्याः सुतनु नियतं दृश्यते चान्तसंस्थम् ।
मन्दाक्रान्ता किल निगदिता पण्डितैः सा वरोरु ॥ ३४ ॥
सुरेन्द्रेभं कर्णं चरणपटहं चन्द्रवदने ।
प्प (?) यस्मिंल्ललितगमने पश्यसि पुनः ॥

नियुक्तं केयूरं मरकतयुतं भावसहितम् ।
ध्वजश्चान्ते यस्याः सुतनु कथिता सा **शिखरिणी** ॥ ३५ ॥
पयोधररसाङ्गदैर्वसुमतीपतिं संयुतम् ।
वरोरु रचयत्करं सुरगजं प्रकस (?) प्रिये ॥
नताङ्गि सततं यथा प्रचालितामलाभध्वजम् ।
भवेच्च **पृथिवी** पदैर्ललितकोमलैर्वाचकैः ॥ ३६ ॥
द्विजगणरवं रत्ने कर्णस्तथाप्यपरो मणिः ।
रवमणि पुनर्भावो बाले तथा विनतासुतः ॥
भवति **हरिणीवृत्तं** भद्रे सदा ललिताक्षरम् ।
बुधजनकृतं नित्यं श्रव्यं मृगाङ्कनिभानने ॥ ३७ ॥
द्विजगणरत्नभावचमरं च शशाङ्कमुखि ।
सरसपताकभावविलसत्कटकं च भवेत् ॥
सुतनु विचित्रबन्धरचितं करपल्लवकम् ।
मुनिजनसंस्तुतं प्रियतमे किल **नर्कुटकम्** ॥ ३८ ॥
पूर्वं माणिक्यं सुतनु कटकं रत्नमेकं सकर्णम् ।
भावं स्वप्तश्चः (सस्पर्शं?) ललितगमने काव्यबन्धप्रयोगे ॥
कुर्यात्स्वाकारं सुतनु नियतं हस्तमेकं वरोरु ।
तार्क्ष्यं मञ्जीरं सुरपतिगजं कीर्तिता **चन्द्रलेखा** ॥ ३९ ॥
द्वे रत्ने चरणं मृगाक्षि रसनायुक्तं च गन्धं पुनः ।
केयूरं सरसं ध्वजं च विमलं यस्मिन्सदा वीक्षसे ॥
हारं निर्मलपद्मरागसहितं देवेश्वरस्य द्विपम् ।
तद्विद्यात्सपताकबन्धसुभगं **शार्दूलविक्रीडितम्** ॥ ४० ॥
मुखे रूपं चैकं मणिरपि भवेत्कर्णरत्ने नियुक्ते ।
ततो मञ्जीरं चेद्रसनियमितं शब्दरूपे पुनर्द्वौ ॥
सुरेन्द्रेभं मत्तं प्रियसखि ततो वीक्षसे सत्पताकम् ।
सुवर्णं मुक्ताढ्यं विरमनियतं **चन्द्रकान्ते**ति गीता ॥ ४१ ॥
आदौ कर्णद्वयं स्यात्सुतनु ललितं वीक्षसे रूपरत्ने ।
मञ्जीरं शब्दयुक्तं रसनियमितं रूपयुक्तं वरोरु ॥
तस्मादैरावणं च ध्वजमपि तथा वैनतेयं सरत्नम् ।
एतद्विद्याद्गुणाढ्ये बुधजनकृतं **सुप्रभा**नाम वृत्तम् ॥ ४२ ॥
आदौ कर्णौ तु कान्ते रवमणिसहितं माणिक्यमपरम् ।
भावस्पर्शस्वरूपं करमपि हि तथा मञ्जीरमतुलम् ॥
तस्मात्कुर्यात्तु मुक्तं शशिमुखि पटहं रत्नं च निधने ।
एतद्वृत्तस्वरूपं बुधजनदयितं ख्यातं परमकम् ॥ ४३ ॥

मुक्तादिरत्नसहितौ पयोधरकरौ तथैव सुभगे ।
माणिक्यरूपचरणं ध्वजं च सहसा निवेश्य सरवम् ॥
ग्रैवेयकं नियमितं वरोरु रचयेत्सदा सपटहम् ।
अन्ते च नूपुरयुतं शशाङ्कवदने **शशाङ्कचरितम्** ॥ ४४ ॥
मुक्तायुग्मं सरत्नं मुकुटमपि भवेद्वैजयन्ती सहारा ।
स्पर्शं रूपं सभावं सुतनु करतलं वीक्षसे पङ्कजाक्षि ॥
नागानां चाप्यमित्रं पुनरपि कटकं रूपकर्णौकयोगि ।
पादे तन्वङ्गि यस्याः प्रचरति सुभगे **स्रग्धरा**नाम वृत्तम् ॥ ४५ ॥
चामररूपयुग्मकटकं शशाङ्कवदने ध्वजं च सरवम् ।
शब्दविभूषितं च नृपतिं समीक्ष्य दयिते पुनः सकटकम् ॥
स्थापय शब्दभावचमरं च शब्दसहितं मणिं च विमलम् ।
पन्नगयुक्तमन्तचरितं वरोरु सुभगे **विशुद्धचरितम्** ॥ ४६ ॥
द्विजगणरत्नरूपचमरं शशाङ्कवदने विमलश्च रसः ।
नरपतिरत्नयुक्तपटहौ मृगाक्षि सुभगे यदि वै परतः ॥
पुनरपि मेखलात्र पतिता नताङ्गि विरमे करपल्लवकौ ।
कविवरपन्नगेन्द्ररचिता सदा प्रियतमे **हयलीलाङ्गी** ॥ ४७ ॥
चामरभावौ सललितगमने रत्नमतः शशिमुखि चरणश्च ।
शब्दसमेता रसरवसहितौ हारमणी वरतनु कुलभद्रे ॥
भामिनि हस्तं पुनरपि दयिते विप्रकरं यदि भवति समेतम् ।
तस्य तु रत्नं पुनरपि ललितं वृत्तमिदं वरतनु किल **तन्वी** ॥ ४८ ॥
चामररूपे शब्दसमेते पुनरपि वरतनु सललितचमरम् ।
पश्यसि बाले रत्नमतो वै वरतनु शशिमुखि सुमधुरकटकम् ॥
रूपसमुक्तं वै ध्वजरत्नं भवति (हि) मृदुघनविपुलकुचयुगे ।
क्रौञ्चपदी वै त्रिद्विजयुक्ता विरचितकरतलनियमितविरमा ॥ ४९ ॥
आदौ बाले मुक्तायुग्मं विकसितकुवलयनयने भवेत्तु सचामरम् ।
पश्चात्कर्णौ मुग्धे तस्मात् समुकुटसरवसपटहैस्तथाप्यपरो रसः ॥
स्पर्शं भावं रत्नं दत्वा वरतनु शशिमुखि सुभगे मया तव कथ्यते ।
मुग्धे भूभृद्युक्तं (हस्तं) पुनरपि नरपतिकटकं **भुजगविजृम्भितम्** ॥ ५० ॥
इति वृत्तजातिसमुच्चये कृतशिष्टशिष्टः पञ्चमो नियमः ।

VI.

जे पिंगलेण भणिआ वासुइमंडव्वछंदआरेहिं ।
तत्तो थोवं वोच्छे छाओअरि छप्पआरेवि ॥ १ ॥

[ये पिङ्गलेन भणिता वासुकिमाण्डव्यछन्दस्काराभ्याम् ।
ततः स्तोकं वक्ष्ये शातोदरि षट्प्रकारानपि ॥ १ ॥]

पत्थारे जे सव्वे णट्ठुद्दिट्ठं तहा अ लहुकिरिअं ।
संखं अद्धाणं विअ छाओअरि तं फुडं भणिमो ॥ २ ॥

[प्रस्तारा ये सर्व्वे नष्टोद्दिष्टं तथा च लघुक्रियाम् ।
संख्यामध्वानमिव शातोदरि तत्स्फुटं भणाम : ॥ २ ॥]

उत्ताइणं मज्झे वित्ता उण थोवआ मए भणिआ ।
जुत्तीए पत्थारे छाओअरि तुज्झ वोच्छामि ॥ ३ ॥

[उक्तादीनां मध्ये वृत्तानि पुन: स्तोकानि मया भणितानि ।
युक्त्या प्रस्तारान् शातोदरि तव वक्ष्यामि ॥ ३ ॥]

सूईमेरुवडाआसमुद्दविवरीअजलहिपाआला ।
तह संवलिपत्थारो सहिओ विवरीयसंवालिणा ॥ ४ ॥

[सूची-मेरु-पताका-समुद्र-विपरीतजलधि-पाताला: ।
तथा शाल्मलिप्रस्तार: सहितो विपरीतशाल्मलिना ॥ ४ ॥]

पमुहंते एक्केक्कं तह विअ मज्झंमि एक्कमब्भहिअं ।
पमुहाओ आरहिअ वड्ढंते सव्वअंकाइं ॥ ५ ॥

[प्रमुखेन्ते एकमेकं तथैव मध्ये एकमभ्यधिकम् ।
प्रमुखादारभ्य वर्द्धन्ते सर्वाङ्का: ॥ ५ ॥]

इक्केक्केण भइज्जइअंते उवरिट्ठिओ(अं) तहा चेअ ।
परिवाडीए मुंचह एक्केक्कं सूइपत्थारे ॥ ६ ॥

[एकैकेन भिद्यन्ते उपरिस्थितं तथा चैव ।
परिपाट्या मुञ्चत एकैकं सूचिप्रस्तारे ॥ ६ ॥]

तं पिंडिज्जउ निउणं जाव अ बीओवि आगओ ठाणो ।
पत्थारपाअगणणा लहुकिरिआ लंभए संखा ॥ ७ ॥

[तत्पिण्ड्यतां निपुणं यावद्द्वितीयमप्यागतं स्थानम् ।
प्रस्तारपातगणना लघुक्रिया लभ्यते संख्या ॥ ७ ॥]

इह कोट्ठआण दोण्हं वड्ढइ हेट्ठट्ठिअं कमेणेअ ।
पमुहंते एक्केक्कं तदो अ दोतिण्णिचत्तारि ॥ ८ ॥

[इह कोष्ठकयोर्द्वयोर्वर्द्धतेऽध:स्थितं क्रमेणैव ।
प्रमुखेन्ते एकैकं ततश्च द्वे त्रीणि चत्वारि ॥ ८ ॥]

उअरिट्ठिअअंकेणं वड्ढइ हिट्ठट्ठिअं कमेणेअ ।
मेरुम्मि होइ गणणा सूईए एस अणुहरइ ॥ ९ ॥

[उपरिस्थिताङ्कन वर्धतेऽधःस्थितं क्रमेणैव ।
मेरौ भवति गणना सूच्या एष अनुसरति ॥ ९ ॥]
सागरवण्णे अंका दोच्चिअ गरुआ अ मज्झिमठ्ठाणे ।
समरे उण एक्कोच्चिअ मेरुम्मि तहेव सूईए ॥ १० ॥
[सागरवर्णे अङ्कौ द्वावेव गुरू च मध्यमस्थानयोः ।
समरे पुनरेक एव मेरौ तथैव सूच्याम् ॥ १० ॥]
मणिरवमालाकारो विउणविउणेहि वड्ढिओ कमसो ।
रइअव्वो पत्थारो णिहणद्धमणीरवध्दो य ॥ ११ ॥
[मणिरवमालाकारो द्विगुणद्विगुणैर्वर्द्धितः क्रमशः ।
रचितव्यः प्रस्तारो निघनार्धमणी रवार्धश्च ॥ ११ ॥]
बीअद्धेसु कहिंचिअ दिज्जइ फरिसोवि अंतिमो छउए ।
तेणेअं पत्थारे वित्ताणं कीरए गणणा ॥ १२ ॥
[द्वितीयार्धेषु कुत्रचित् दीयते स्पर्शोप्यन्तिमः शाते ।
तेनेयं प्रस्तारे वृत्तानां क्रियते गणना ॥ १२ ॥]
रअणाणि जहिच्छाए ठविऊ मुद्धे ठवेह पत्थारं ।
ताव अ पिंडेअ फुडं फरिसा सव्वे ठिआ जाव ॥ १३ ॥
[रत्नानि यथेच्छं स्थापयित्वा मुग्धे स्थापय प्रस्तारम् ।
तावच्च पिण्डय स्फुटं स्पर्शाः सर्वे स्थिता यावत् ॥ १३ ॥]
पढमचमरस्स हिट्ठे फरिसो, पुरओ जहाकमेणेअ ।
मग्गे जे परिसिट्ठा कडएहिं तेहिं पूरेहि ॥ १४ ॥
[प्रथमचमरस्याधः स्पर्शः, पुरतो यथाक्रमेणैव ।
मार्गतो ये परिशिष्टाः कटकैस्तान्पूरय ॥ १४ ॥]
एकम्मिवि पत्थारे पत्थारा बहुअरा विणिद्दिट्ठा ।
मग्गट्ठिआ तहाविअ छाओअरि तुज्झ वोच्छामि ॥ १५ ॥
[एकस्मिन्नपि प्रस्तारे प्रस्तारा बहुतरा विनिर्दिष्टाः ।
मार्गस्थितास्तथापि च शातोदरि तव वक्ष्यामि ॥ १५ ॥]
अट्ठक्खरपत्थारे उत्ताईओ हुअंति सव्वे अ ।
विहईछंदंमि तहा पत्थारो नवविहो होइ ॥ १६ ॥
[अष्टाक्षरप्रस्तारे उक्तादयो भवन्ति सर्वा एव ।
बृहतीछन्दसि तथा प्रस्तारो नवविधो भवति ॥ १६ ॥]
एए सव्वे छंदा उक्किइछंदंमि होन्ति पत्थारे ।
मइ भणिआ जुत्तीए लक्खिज्जसु तं पअत्तेण १ ॥ १७ ॥

[एतानि सर्वाणि छन्दांस्युत्कृतिछन्दसि भवन्ति प्रस्तारे ।
मया भणितानि युक्त्या लक्षय त्वं प्रयत्नेन ॥ १७ ॥]

एसोच्चिअ पत्थारो मत्ताविताण साहिओ किंतु ।
मत्ता जत्थ ण पूरइ फरिसं पढमं तहिं देहि ॥ १८ ॥

[एष एव प्रस्तारो मात्रावृत्तानां साधितः किन्तु ।
मात्रा यत्र न पूर्यते स्पर्शं प्रथमं तत्र देहि ॥ १८ ॥]

गाहाविसमगणाणं हेट्ठा अंतचमरस्स दे छउए ।
मत्तापूरणफरिसं मज्झगअं पढमभणिअंपि ॥ १९ ॥

[गाथाविषमगणानामधोन्तचमरस्य देहि ज्ञाते ।
मात्रापूरणस्पर्शं मध्यगतं प्रथमभणितमपि ॥ १९ ॥]

एवं णरिंदरहिए विसमगणे कुणइ गाहाण ।
पढमलहू पत्थारो ठविअव्वो विसममत्ताण ॥ २० ॥

[एवं नरेन्द्ररहितान्विषमगणान्कुरुत गाथानाम् ।
प्रथमलघुः प्रस्तारः स्थापयितव्यो विषममात्राणाम् ॥ २० ॥]

पढमखाहो चमरं उअरि अ पुरओ जहाक्कमेणंपि ।
मग्गट्ठिआवि फरिसा विवरीअं जाण सलिलणिहिम् ॥ २१ ॥

[प्रथमखाधश्चमरं उपरि च पुरतो यथाक्रमेणापि ।
मार्गस्थिता अपि स्पर्शा विपरीतं जानीहि सलिलनिधिम् ॥ २१ ॥]

संखं ठवेह पढमं पाअंकेणावि गुणह तं हेट्ठे ।
तस्सवि अद्धं घेत्तुं तिहि ठाणेहिं विभज्जेज्ज ॥ २२ ॥

[संख्यां स्थापय प्रथमं पादाङ्केनापि गुणय तामधः ।
तस्याप्यर्धं गृहीत्वा त्रिषु स्थानेषु विभज्यताम् ॥ २२ ॥]

एए पंच पएसा मज्झिमअं तिउणअं करेज्जेह ।
संखा वण्णा मत्ता लहुगुरुआ होन्ति पाआले ॥ २३ ॥

[एते पञ्च प्रदेशा मध्यमस्त्रिगुणः कर्तव्य इह ।
संख्या वर्णा मात्रा लघवो गुरवो भवन्ति पाताले ॥ २३ ॥]

ठविऊण तिण्णि तीस अ सत्तावीस अ कमेण एएण ।
वड्ढंति दोण्णि एक्क अ ल्हसइ अ एक्कं कमेणेअ ॥ २४ ॥

[स्थापयित्वा त्रीणि त्रिंशच्च सप्तविंशतिं च क्रमेणैतेन ।
वर्द्धन्ते द्वावेकश्च ह्रसते चैकः क्रमेणैव ॥ २४ ॥]

दोवड्ढि इक्कहाणी एक्केक्कं वड्ढए तहा मज्झे ।
साव समप्पइ एअं दोच्चिअ णिहणे ठिआ जाव ॥ २५ ॥

[द्वित्र्द्धिरेकहानिरेकैकं वर्द्धते तथा मध्ये ।
तावत्समर्प्यते एतव्द्वावेव निधने स्थितौ यावत् ॥ २५ ॥]
छव्वीसं गाहाणं पत्थारो संवली मए भणिओ ।
इअ संवलिपत्थारो मत्तावित्ताण काअव्वो ॥ २६ ॥
[षड्विंशतेर्गाथानां प्रस्तारः शाल्मली मया भाणितः ।
इति शाल्मलिप्रस्तारो मात्रावृत्तानां कर्तव्यः ॥ २६ ॥]
लहुआणं वण्णाणं आणअणे तहविअ गुरूणं ।
तीपण्णासं पंचावण्णे दोच्चिअ कमेण ठविऊण ॥ २७ ॥
[लघूनां वर्णानामानयने तथैव गुरूणाम् ।
त्रिपञ्चाशत्पञ्चपञ्चाशत् द्वौ चैव क्रमेण स्थापयित्वा ॥ २७ ॥]
दोहाणि एक्कवड्ढी एक्केक्कं हारए तहा मज्झे ।
विवरीअसंवलीए होइ विहाणं इमं छउए ॥ २८ ॥
[द्विहानिरेकवृद्धिरेकैकं ह्रियते तथा मध्ये ।
विपरीतशाल्मलेर्भवति विधानमिदं ज्ञाते ॥ २८ ॥]
एत्तिअमेत्ते अंके कअरो वित्तित्ति णठ्ठअं होइ ।
एअं जाणह वित्तं कअम्मि ठाणम्मि उद्दिठ्ठं ॥ २९ ॥
[एतावन्मात्रेऽङ्के कतरद्वृत्तमिति नष्टकं भवति ।
एतज्जानीहि वृत्तं कतमे स्थाने (इति) उद्दिष्टम् ॥ २९ ॥]
विसमंकेसु अ चमरं समेसु फरिसं ठवेह वित्ताणं ।
अद्धद्धं ओसक्कइ णठ्ठंके सव्वकडआइं ॥ ३० ॥
[विषमाङ्केषु च चमरं समेषु स्पर्शं स्थापय वृत्तानाम् ।
अर्धमर्धमप्ष्वष्कते नष्टाङ्के सर्वकटकानि ॥ ३० ॥]
जत्थ अ ण देइ भाअं एक्कं दाऊण तत्थ पिंडेह ।
भाए दिण्णे अ फुडं मयच्छि णठ्ठं विआणेहि ॥ ३१ ॥
[यत्र च न ददाति भागमेकं दत्वा तत्र पिण्डय ।
भागे दत्ते च स्फुटं मृगाक्षि नष्टं विजानीहि ॥ ३१ ॥]
अद्धद्धं ओसक्कइ बहुसो बाहाइ जाव अ समत्तं ।
जं णिहणे तं वित्तं णठ्ठंमि अ पच्चअं एअं ॥ ३२ ॥
[अर्धमर्धमवष्वष्कते बहुशो भागाद्यावच्च समाप्तम् ।
यन्निधने तद्वृत्तं नष्टे च प्रत्ययः एषः ॥ ३२ ॥]
अंतं फरिसं धेत्तुं विउणा विउणेसु सुअणु वण्णेसु ।
एक्केक्कं चमरेसुं मुंचह उद्दिठ्ठए छउए ॥ ३३ ॥

[अन्तिमं स्पर्शं गृहीत्वा द्विगुणद्विगुणेषु सुतनु वर्णेषु ।
एकमेकं चमरेषु मुग्धोद्दिष्टे ज्ञाते ॥ ३३ ॥]

एआइ पिंडणाए जं अंकं होइ अंतिम मुद्धे ।
तं कहिअव्वं वित्तं उद्दिट्ठे पच्चअं एयं ॥ ३४ ॥

[एतया पिण्डनया योऽङ्को भवत्यन्तिमो मुग्धे ।
तत्कथितव्यं वृत्तमुद्दिष्टे प्रत्यय एषः ॥ ३४ ॥]

जे पढमठ्ठा वण्णा मत्तावित्ताण णिअमिआ होंति ।
ते दिज्जंत णट्ठे; उद्दिट्ठे पुंसह तेच्चेअ ॥ ३५ ॥

[ये प्रथमस्था वर्णा मात्रावृत्तानां नियमिता भवन्ति ।
ते दीयन्ते नष्टे; उद्दिष्टे प्रोञ्छ तानेव ॥ ३५ ॥]

मत्तावित्ताण सआ पुच्छिज्जन्तो अ वण्णपरिमाणं ।
पुट्ठाउ पुंसह एक्कं मूलं दाऊण जाणेज्ज ॥ ३६ ॥

[मात्रावृत्तानां सदा पृच्छयमानश्च वर्णपरिमाणम् ।
पृष्टात्प्रोञ्छैकं मूलं दत्वा जानीयात् ॥ ३६ ॥]

काऊण वण्णगणणं एक्कं दाऊण पुंसह मूलंपि ।
जं सेसं तं जाणह मत्तावित्ताण उद्दिट्ठं ॥ ३७ ॥

[कृत्वा वर्णगणनामेकं दत्वा प्रोञ्छ मूलमपि ।
यच्छेषं तज्जानीहि मात्रावृत्तानामुद्दिष्टम् ॥ ३७ ॥]

सविअप्पउणं काऊण मुंच हेठ्ठाउ अंसअं सेसं ॥
पडिलोमं उद्दिट्ठे पुरओ णट्ठं विआणेहि ॥ ३८ ॥

[स्वविकल्पगुणं कृत्वा मुञ्चाधस्तनमंशं शेषम् ।
प्रतिलोममुद्दिष्टे पुरतो नष्टं विजानीहि ॥ ३८ ॥]

सविअप्पेणुव्वुत्ते सुद्धे रासिंमि अंतिमं कुणह ।
सेसे सरूवअं चिअ लद्धे सेसे गणं देहि ॥ ३९ ॥

[स्वविकल्पेनाद्वृत्ते शुद्धे राशावन्तिमं कुरु ।
शेषे स्वरूपमेव लब्धे शेषे गणं देहि ॥ ३९ ॥]

वित्ते जित्तिअसंखा ठविऊण ठवेह वित्तपाअंकं ।
एएहिं अ गुणिएहिं अद्धेण हुअंति गुरुलहुआ ॥ ४० ॥

[वृत्ते यावती संख्या (तां) स्थापयित्वा स्थापय वृत्तपादाङ्कम् ।
एताभ्यां गुणिताभ्यामर्धेन भवन्ति गुरुलघवः ॥ ४० ॥]

वित्ताण वण्णगणणे मत्ताओ हुअंति जाओ अहिआओ ।
ते गरुआ सेसा उण लहुआ सव्वासु जाईसु ॥ ४१ ॥

[वृत्तानां वर्णगणने मात्रा भवन्ति या अधिकाः ।
ते गुरवः शेषाः पुनर्लघवः सर्वासु जातिषु ॥ ४१ ॥]
अंतिमवण्णे विउणं वण्णे वण्णे अ विउणअं कुणह ।
पायक्खरपरिमाणं संखाए एस णिद्देसो ॥ ४२ ॥
[अन्तिमवर्णे द्विगुणं वर्णे वर्णे च द्विगुणं कुरुत ।
पादाक्षरपरिमाणं संख्याया एष निर्देशः ॥ ४२ ॥]
एक्कक्खरम्मि दुच्चिअ विउणा विउणा य सेसवण्णेसु ।
पत्थरिअव्वं छउए जावं ते होंति छव्वीसा ॥ ४३ ॥
[एकाक्षरे द्वावेव द्विगुणा द्विगुणाश्च शेषवर्णेषु ।
प्रस्तरितव्यं शाते यावत्ते भवन्ति षड्विंशतिः ॥ ४३ ॥]
चउसठ्ठी अठ्ठसआ अट्ठसहस्सेगसत्तरी लक्खा ।
सुन्दरि छक्कोडीओ उक्किइछंदम्मि संखाई ॥ ४४ ॥
[चतुःषष्टिरष्टशतान्यष्टसहस्राण्येकसप्ततिर्लक्षाः ।
सुन्दरि षट्कोट्य उत्कृतिछन्दसि संख्यायाः ॥ ४४ ॥]
एवं च वण्णवित्ते मत्तावित्ताण अन्नहा होइ ।
दो दो पुव्वविअप्पे जा मेलविऊण जायए संखा ।
सा उत्तरमत्ताणं संखाए एस निद्देसो ॥ ४५ ॥
[एवं च वर्णवृत्ते मात्रावृत्तानामन्यथा भवति ।
द्वौ द्वौ पूर्वविकल्पौ या मेलयित्वा जायते संख्या ।
सा उत्तरमात्राणां संख्याया एष निर्देशः ॥ ४५ ॥]
गाहाण समा भेआ खंधअपमुहाण विसमआ होंति ।
विवरीयच्चिअ लहुआ संवलिपत्थारणिद्दिट्ठा ॥ ४६ ॥
[गाथानां समा भेदाः स्कन्धकप्रमुखानां विषमा भवन्ति ।
विपरीता एव लघवः शाल्मलिप्रस्तारनिर्दिष्टाः ॥ ४६ ॥]
गाहाणं जाईओ सुन्दरि भणिआओ जइवि छव्वीसा ।
जलणिहिपत्थारे उण अण्णच्चिअ पिंडणा होइ ॥ ४७ ॥
[गाथानां जातयः सुन्दरि भणिता यद्यपि षड्विंशतिः ।
जलनिधिप्रस्तारे पुनरन्यैव पिण्डना भवति ॥ ४७ ॥]
सव्वे पुव्वविअप्पा गुणिऊणं उत्तराण दाअव्वा ।
गाहासंखाणअणं इअ पुव्वाणं अ णिद्दिट्ठं ॥ ४८ ॥
[सर्वे पूर्वविकल्पा गुणयित्वोत्तरेषां दातव्याः ।
गाथासंख्यानयनमिति पूर्वेषां च निर्दिष्टम् ॥ ४८ ॥]

अट्ठेव अ कोडीओ परओ एकूणवीसलक्खाइं ।
वीससहस्साइं तहा गाहाणं एत्तिआ संखा ॥ ४९ ॥

[अष्टैव च कोट्यः परत एकोनविंशतिर्लक्षाः ।
विंशतिसहस्राणि तथा गाथानामियती संख्या ॥ ४९ ॥]

वइआलिअसमपाए मग्गट्ठिअचलणमाणमुव्वसमु ।
तइअचउत्थेसु सआ ठाणेसुं णिअविअप्पगुणिएसुं ॥ ५० ॥

[वैतालीयसमपादे मार्गस्थितचरणमानमुन्मार्जय ।
तृतीयचतुर्थयोः सदा स्थानयोर्निजविकल्पगुणितयोः ॥ ५० ॥]

दुवईगणसव्वाणं मत्ताअडिलाण तह अ सम्माणं ।
लहुगणणं विअ विहदुह छाओअरि सीसआणं च ॥ ५१ ॥

[द्विपदीगण × × × मात्राडिलानां तथा च साम्यानाम् ।
लहुगणनमिव × × × × शातोदरि शीर्षकाणां च ॥ ५१ ॥]

चउअंगुलो अ रामो तिहिं रामेहिं विआणसु विअत्थिम् ।
दोण्णि विअत्था हत्थो चउहत्थो धणुहरो होइ ॥ ५२ ॥

[चतुरङ्गुलश्च रामस्त्रिभी रामैर्विजानीहि वितस्तिम् ।
द्वौ वितस्ती हस्तश्चतुर्हस्तो धनुर्धरो भवति ॥ ५२ ॥]

धणुअरदुईसहस्सा मअच्छि कोसस्स होइ परिमाणम् ।
कोसा अट्ठ तहच्चिअ जोइणसंखा विणिद्दिट्ठा ॥ ५३ ॥

[धनुर्धरद्विसहस्रं मृगाक्षि कोशस्य भवति परिमाणम् ।
कोशा अष्टौ तथैव योजनसंख्या विनिर्दिष्टा ॥ ५३ ॥]

एक्कंगुलो अ संठइ चमरो फरिसोवि अंगुलं चेअ ।
चमरफरिसांतराले तह एक्कं अंगुलं होइ ॥ ५४ ॥

[एकाङ्गुलश्च संतिष्ठते चमरः स्पर्शोप्यङ्गुलं चैव ।
चमरस्पर्शान्तराले तथैकमङ्गुलं भवति ॥ ५४ ॥]

अट्ठक्खरस्स हत्थो तिण्णि धणू अंगुलं तअं रामो ।
विहई कआ(तओ)वि विउणा तत्तो विउणा वि पंत्तित्ति ॥ ५५ ॥

[अष्टाक्षरस्य हस्तस्त्रीणि (पद्म ?) धनूंष्यङ्गुलत्रयं रामः ।
बृहती ततोपि द्विगुणा ततो द्विगुणापि पङ्क्तिरिति ॥ ५५ ॥]

एक्केक्कंमि अ पुंसह रूअं विउणीकअंमि रासिंमि ।
एवं विउणाविउणं पिंडिज्जह जाव छव्वीसं ॥ ५६ ॥

[एकैकस्मिन्नपमार्जय रूपं द्विगुणीकृते राशौ ।
एवं द्विगुणं द्विगुणं पिण्ड्यतां यावच्छड्विंशतिः ॥ ५६ ॥]

जोइणसत्तासीई तिण्णि अ कोसा धणूण इक्कहियं ।
सअमुक्किईअ हत्थो रामो इक्को अ अंगुला तिण्णि ॥ ५७ ॥
[योजनानि समाशीतिस्त्रयश्च कोशा धनुषामेकाधिकम् ।
शतमुत्कृतेर्हस्तो राम एकश्चाङ्गुलानि त्रीणि ॥ ५७ ॥]
एक्कक्खरपत्थारे मअच्छि एक्को अ होइ फरिसो अ ।
बेअक्खरपत्थारे बेआ फरिसा विणिद्दिठ्ठा ॥ ५८ ॥
[एकाक्षरप्रस्तारे मृगाक्षि एकश्च भवति स्पर्शश्च ।
द्व्यक्षरप्रस्तारे द्वौ स्पर्शौ विनिर्दिष्टौ ॥ ५८ ॥]
तोहि तो विउणाउवड्डिया तहा चेअ । (?)
चउवण्णेसु वि विउणा वितेतममवआ (?) ॥ ५९ ॥
एवं विउणाउव्विअ बेचउहिं वड्डिआ मुणेअव्वा ।
लहुक्किरिअत्ति अ जावअ उक्किइछंदं समत्तंसि ॥ ६० ॥
[एवं द्विगुणा एव द्विचतुर्भिर्वर्धिता ज्ञातव्या ।
लघुक्रियेति च यावदुत्कृतिछन्दसि समाप्ता सा ॥ ६० ॥]
इअ कइसिट्ठविरइजाईसमुच्चए छठ्ठो णिअमो संमत्तो । कइसिठ्ठ छंदं समत्तं ॥

NOTES.

CHAPTER V.

N.B.—I merely give the Akṣaragaṇas in a Pāda of every metre in Ch. V. for the sake of brevity. In the definitions, the names of ornaments are used to signify a long letter. Short letters are meant by Rava, Rūpa, Śabda and Sparśa. for the rest, see the glossary in my last article (JBBRAS., New Series, vol. V., p. 77) and the text I. 17-20; 27-29.

(1) गो. S. (2) नौ. SS. (3) नारी :—म. (4) मृगवधू :—न, ग. (5) अक्षरपङ्क्ति :—भ, ग, ग. (6) तनुमध्याः—त, य. (7) मदलेखा:—म, स, ग., (8) हरिविलसितक :—न, न, ग. (9) विद्युन्मालाः—म, म, ग, ग. (10) श्यामा :—त, स, ग, ग. (11) वितान :—भ, भ, ग, ग. (12) माणवकक्रीडितक :—भ, त, ल, ग. (13) मालिनी :—र, ज, ग, ग. (14) कुसुम :—न, न, ल, ग. (15) श्लोक :—In the uneven Pādas the seventh letter is short; the fifth is short and the sixth is long in all the four Pādas. Each Pāda has eight letters. (16) गुर्वी:—न, स, य. (17) त्वरितगति :—न, ज, न, ग. (18) चम्पकमाला :—भ, म, स, ग. (19) इन्द्रवज्रा :—त, त, ज, ग, ग. (20) उपेन्द्रवज्रा :—ज, त, ज, ग, ग. (21) मिश्रा is made up of lines of both इन्द्रवज्रा and उपेन्द्रवज्रा. (22) शालिनी :—म, त, त, ग, ग. (23) भ्रमरविलसित :—म, भ, न, ल, ग. (24) दोधकः—भ, भ, भ, ग, ग. (25) स्वागता :—र, न, भ, ग, ग. (26) वसन्तमञ्जरी :—ज, त, ज, र. (27) तोटक :—स, स, स, स. (28) द्रुतविलम्बित :—न, भ, भ, र. (29) मयूरपिच्छ :—म, न, ज, र, ग. (30) सदागति :—ज, भ, स, ज, ग. (31) सिंहोन्नताः—त, भ, ज, ज, ग, ग. (32) मालिनी :—न, न, म, य, य. (33) प्रमुदिता :—भ, र, न, र, न, ग. (34) मन्दाक्रान्ता:—म, भ, न, त, त, ग, ग. (35) शिखरिणी :—य, म, न, स, भ, ल, ग. (36) पृथिवी :—ज, स, ज, स, य, ल, ग. (37) हरिणी :—न, स, म, र, स, ल, ग. (38) नर्कुटक :—न, ज, भ, ज, ज, ल, ग. (39) चन्द्रलेखा :—म, त, न, य, य, य. (40) शार्दूलविक्रीडित :—म, स, ज, स, त, त, ग. (41) चन्द्रकान्ता :—य, म, न, स, र, र, ग. (42) सुप्रभा :—म, र, भ, न, त, त, ग, ग. (43) वृत्त :—भ, न, य, भ, ल, ग. (44) शशाङ्करचित :—त, भ, ज, भ, ज, भ, ल, ग, (45) स्रग्धरा :—म, र, भ, न, य, य, य. (46) विशुद्धचरित :—भ, र, न, र, न, र, न, ग. (47) हयलीलाङ्गी :—न, ज, भ, ज, भ, ज, ज, ल, ग. (48) तन्वी :—भ, त, न, स, भ, भ, न, य. (49) क्रौञ्चपदी :—भ, म, स, भ, न, न, न, न. (50) भुजङ्गविजृम्भित :—म, म, त, न, न, न, र, स, ल, ग.

Of these (10) श्यामा, (14) कुसुम, (16) गुर्वी, and (47) हयलीलाङ्गी are not found in हेमचन्द्र's छन्दोनुशासन, while (5) अक्षरपङ्क्ति, (11) वितान, (13) मालिनी, (18) चम्पकमाला, (21) मिश्रा or सैकत्रिपादा, (26) वसन्तमञ्जरी, (29) मयूरपिच्छ, (30) सदागति, (31) सिंहोन्नता, (33) प्रमुदिता, (38) नर्कुटक-(39) चन्द्रलेखा, (41) चन्द्रकान्ता, (42) सुप्रभा, (43) वृत्त and (46) विशुद्ध-चरित are found respectively under the following names:—(5) पङ्क्ति, (11) चित्रपदा, (13) सिंहलेखा, (18) रुक्मवती, (21) उपजाति, (26) वंशस्थ, (29)

प्रहर्षिणी, (30) रुचिरा, (31) वसन्ततिलक, (33) मह्लिनी, (38) अवितथ, (39) कुसुमितलतावेल्लिता, (41) मेघविस्फूर्जिता, (42) चित्रमाला, (43) सुवदना and (46) मन्द्रक. As regards (18) चम्पकमाला, (20) वसन्तमञ्जरी, (31) सिंहोन्नता, (38) नर्कुटक, and (42) सुप्रभा, Hemachandra is aware of these names and mentions them.

CHAPTER VI.

V. 2. After v. 2 the following two stanzas appear to have been read by the commentator; they merely enumerate the 26 Jātis:—

उत्ता तहातिउत्ता मज्झअसहिआ पइट्ठसुपइट्ठा ।
गायत्त्युण्ही अणुहुभ विहई पंती तहा तिट्ठ ॥ १ ॥
जगइअइजगइसक्करि तह अइसक्करि य अट्ठि अइअट्ठी ।
धिइअइधिइकिइपकिइ आकिसमभिउक्किईसाहिआ ॥ २ ॥

V. 7. प्रस्तारपातगणना i. e. finding out the number of Prastāras i. e. the Prastāras containing one or more short or long letters.

V. 10. "In the Meru or Sūcī of a metre with an odd number of letters in its Pāda (सागरवर्णे), the two middlemost sums will be the biggest while in that of a metre with an even number of letters in its Pāda (समेरे), there will be only one biggest sum in the middle."

V. 26-27. In the text, the lines occur in the following order (1) इअ संवलि० (2) छव्वीसं० (3) लहुआ० (4) तीपण्णासं०

V. 30 'नष्टाङ्के सति सर्वकटकानि सर्वगुरवः स्थाप्यन्ते । नष्टत्वमङ्कस्यैकप्राप्ति':।—Com.

Vv. 35-37. The verses explain the Naṣṭa and Uddiṣṭa processes as regards the *letters* of a Mātrāvṛtta. The number of letters obtaining in the first permutation (Prathamasthā Varṇā) should be added in the case of Naṣṭa and subtracted in the case of Uddiṣṭa. This is further explained in the next two stanzas. When the *total number* of letters in a certain permutation of a Mātrāvṛtta—the serial number of which is given—is asked (i.e. is unknown or Naṣṭa), deduct 1 from the given *serial number* and add the number of letters obtaining in the first permutation (this is called Mūla in v. 36 which is the same as Prathamasthā

Varṇā in v. 35. The Mūla of a Gāthā, for example, is 30, see under Śālmali Prastāra). The resulting figure is the required number. In the same way, when the number of letters is given (i. e. Uddiṣṭa) and we are required to find out the *serial number* of the given permutation, we should add 1 to the number of letters and deduct the Mūla from it. The figure thus obtained is the serial number of the given permutation.

Vv. 38. 'स्वश्चासौ विकल्पः स्वविकल्पः तेन गुणनं स्वविकल्पगुणनं प्रत्येकमंशकस्य यः स्वः आत्मीयभेदो विकल्प्यते यथा गाथायाः प्रथमस्य चत्वारोऽनंतरं पञ्चेति । तेन प्रतिलोममधः प्रभृत्यन्येषां विकल्पानां गुणनं कलनं संख्यानं कुर्यात् । कृत्वाचाधस्तस्यैवांशस्य येऽशाः संभवन्ति तान्मुञ्च त्यज ।—Com. For details, cf. Hemacandra, Chandonuśāsana, p. 48b.

V. 39. cf. प्रत्येकमंशकस्य यः स्वविकल्पस्तेन तस्मिन्नष्टादुद्धृत्ते शोधिते सति विलोकर्नीयं यदि शुध्यति तदान्तिमं गणं सर्वलघुं देहि शेषे च × × सरूपमेव यद्येकः शिष्यते तदा प्रथमं द्वौ चेत्तदान्तगुरुं तृतीये मध्यगुरुमादि गुरुं वा । किंच लब्धे शेषे एकैकादौ गणं देहि एकेनाधिकं भागहारिणं कुर्वित्यर्थः ।—Com. For further details and examples cf. Hemacandra, Chandonuśāsana p. 47b.

V. 40. संख्या is the total number of permutations of the metre. पादाङ्क is the number of letters in a line. By multiplying these two together and then dividing the multiplication by 2, we get the total number of either the short or the long letters in all the permutations of a metre taken together.

V. 41. In all Jātis, in order to know the number of short and long letters *in a given permutation*, we *should* count the letters in it and deduct them from the number of its Mātrās which of course is fixed. The remainder represents the number of long letters; the rest are short ones.

V. 45. The commentary on the first line of this stanza is missing.

V. 47. गाथानां समा भेदाः षड्विंशतिः स्कन्धकानां विषमा एकोनत्रिंशत् । लघवः पुनर्विपरीताः समानां विषमा विषमाणां च समा इत्यर्थः । एते च भेदा लघवश्च मया शाल्मलिप्रस्तारे दर्शिताः ।—Com.

Vv. 48-49. Another way of finding out the Saṅkhyā of a Gāthā is to multiply together the *number of permutations* of the

different Gaṇas in it. Thus the number of permutations of the first gaṇa of a Gāthā is 4: that of the second is 5; that of the third is 4 and so on. By multiplying all these together, we get 81920000 which is the total number of the permutations of a Gāthā.

V. 50 is composed by the commentator, though the first line is found in the text. Says the commentator:—अनया प्रक्रियया वैतालीयादीनामतिव्याप्तिर्नायातीत्यतोस्माभिर्गाथेयं विरचिता । वैतालीयस्य प्रत्येकं द्विमात्रे द्विप्रभेदगुणिते समपादे द्वितीयचतुर्थादौ तृतीयचतुर्थगणस्थानयोः निजेनात्मीये विकल्पेन गुणितयोः सतोः मार्गोस्थितचरणमानं पश्चान्निविष्टपादसंख्यामुन्मार्जय शोधय ।

Vv. 51-55. The commentary on these stanzas is missing.

V. 56. The commentator says that he composed the first half of this stanza to avoid the अतिव्याप्ति. cf. एवं त्रिष्टुप्प्रभृतीनां द्विगुणद्विगुणया पिण्डनया पिण्डय तावद्यावत्षड्विंशत्यक्षरोत्कृतिरागच्छति । अत्र सर्वत्रैव द्विगुणं सत्येकस्य लोपः कार्यः। इत्यतिव्याप्तिपरिहारायास्माभिर्गाथार्धं निवेशितम्। एकैकस्मि। एकैकस्मिन्नपमार्जय रूपं द्विगुणीकृते राशौ । अनेन गाथार्धेन सर्वेषां अध्वयुक्तिर्घटते । एतदेवोक्तमन्यैर्यथा—द्वाभ्यां समहता संख्या रूपेणैकेन वर्जिता । छिन्नवृत्ताङ्गुलव्याप्तिरध्वयोगः प्रकीर्तितः इति । cf. Hemacandra, p. 49b.

V. 57. On this verse, the commentary is as follows:—योजनानि सप्ताशीतिः द्वौ क्रोशौ धनुःशतमेकाधिकं हस्त एकः द्वौ रामौ उत्कृतिछन्दसः परिमाणम् । अयमप्यनार्षः पाठः । यद्वृत्ताङ्गुलद्विगुणाया मूलसंख्याया एकोनन्यूनत्वात् अङ्गुलानां त्रयोदशकोट्यः द्वाचत्वारिंशल्लक्षाणि सप्तदशसहस्राणि सप्तशतानि सप्तविंशत्यधिकानि संभवंति । . . . . . . तेनैवमियं गाथा पठनीया—जोअणसत्तासीई &c. From this it would seem that the original form of the Gāthā was somewhat as follows:—जोअणसत्तासीई दुण्णि अ कोसा धणूण इक्कहियं । सअ; हत्थो दो रामा उक्किइछंदंमि परिमाणं ॥

Between v. 55 & v. 56 the following line is found in the text:—
अंतो उभरेणं विअ दंडलभेआ विणिद्दिट्ठा ।

Vv. 58-60. The commentator does not comment upon these stanzas. They give the total number of short letters occurring in the different permutations of each Varṇavṛtta taken together beginning with Uktā and ending with Utkṛti. But why should they occur here? Their proper place is after Vv. 40-41.

SOME PARALLELISMS IN INDO-ARYAN AND DRAVIDIAN WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO MARATHI, GUJARATI AND KANARESE.

By Alfred Master, C.I.E., I.C.S.

(*Continued from Vol. V, p.* 140.)

Chapter VIII.

VERBS.

§ 20. *The Present Tense.*

77. The types used by the three languages differ, M. & K. use the present participle with endings which in M. are a queer mixture of verbal personal and pronominal endings and in K. are merely the usual pronominal endings used to denote person in verbs. G. uses the Aorist with the verb to be. The compound Present is a feature of Old Western Rājasthānī [80] but is not recognised in the *Mughdāvabodhamauktika*.[81] It may be that *Old Gujarati* actually did not possess this form, as Dr. Bloch believes (§ 249 p. 249), but there is no reason to assume that the *Mughdā.* would have contained the idiom, if it was in use, or that Old Gujarati is not intimately associated with Old Western Rājasthānī. Together with this peculiar idiom G. possesses the forms present participle plus indicative of *hovuṁ* become and the past tense of the verb 'to be.' Khansaheb and Sheth, § 217, quote *huṁ pīto houṁ* I am drinking, *huṁ pīto hato* I was drinking and I have met *huṁ pīto hoīś* I may be drinking. Dr. Bloch (§ 249) states that the present tenses of all the languages of the eastern group are explained by a welding of the verb "to be" with the present participle. But this is not the only possible explanation and the eastern group may have possessed two alternative forms, one the Aorist plus auxiliary and the other the Present participle plus auxiliary like G.

[80] Tessitori, I. A. 1915, p. 78.

[81] L. S. I. Guj. p. 360.

78. The K. form is modern, *i.e.*, dating from about 1600 A.D.[82] It is composed of the present participle with the verbal suffixes *-ēne*, *-i*, *āne*, etc. The suffixes of the 3rd Persons have nominal endings (or pronominal which amounts to the same thing in K.) modified for gender. It is not settled whether these suffixes are remnants of the verb "to be," but they probably are. They are derived in that case from the substantive verb *ap-* > *ah*. The G. form of the Present has no inflexion for gender. The K. form inflects only for the 3rd Person singular and plural. This inflexion is strictly economical. It is unnecessary for a speaker to distinguish the gender of the person spoken to or his own gender, because it causes no confusion, if he does not. But it is necessary to distinguish the gender of persons or things spoken of. M. on the other pursues the differentiation of gender to its logical extreme, to the extent of pedantry.

79. K. has made several efforts to form a present indicative with a verbal noun (used as a participle) and the verb "to be." Besides the present participle, the past verbal participle was also used. This experiment must have been made before the verbal noun was definitely earmarked as a past participle. The form now survives as a remote future (*vide* § 22) i.e., *māḍyenu* I may make, representing *māḍi-ahenu*.[83] *Māḍenu*, i.e., *māḍa-ahenu* is an alternative. The two forms of the present in K. may both be parallel to the two modern I.-A. forms. That is to say, the form with the present participle is found in both and the G. form Aorist plus substantive verb may be in origin the absolutive (corresponding with the K. past verbal participle) plus the substantive verb. The phrase *karuṁ chuṁ*, in this case represents *kari chuṁ*, *kari* being afterwards made to assume a personal verbal ending to agree with *chuṁ* from analogy with the Aorist. The *Oḍiya* forms support this view. They are *karu acchi* I am doing, *kari acchi* I have done, *karu theli* I was doing, etc. The phrase *karu acchi* is contracted into *karuchi* and the conjugation then proceeds *karuchi, karucu, karuci, karācu karāco, karācanti.*

[82] Kittel Grammar, p. 40, 135.

[83] It is perhaps not a mere coincidence that the absolutive participle in G. ends in *-i*, e.g., *kari* and in Hindustani is the verb-root *kar.*

Bengali has *karcci* said to be a contraction of *kariti-chi*, the present participle plus the substantive verb. The *Oḍiya* forms indicate the possibility of the G. perfect *karyo chuṁ* being also a development of *kari chuṁ* meaning 'I have made' (*vide* also § 23). These considerations suggest an interplay of I.-A. and Dr. forms adopted by I.-A. to meet the needs of Dravidian speakers and by Dr. to develope a language which was otherwise unable to express the finer shades of tense-meaning.

80. M. does not possess the absolutive in *-i* and took a different course, concentrating on the present participle. Dr. Bloch (§ 248) considers the endings in M. to be mere additions of the pronoun to the present participle or due to a form more ancient than the present participle in *-tā*. The latter alternative seems preferable. The modern pronoun is declined *to tī teṁ, te tyā tīṁ* which do not correspond with the endings of the present tense *-toṁ -teṁ -teṁ, -tos -tes -tes; -to -te -teṁ* in the singular or to the purely verbal endings of the plural. It appears rather that the tense is a compromise between two forms—an absolute present participle, e.g., *paḍto* (cf. *kartā* in Hindustani, which is often used to express the present tense irrespective of gender, ungrammatical though it is) and the regular verbal endings *-eṁ, -es, -e, -ūṁ, -āṁ, -at*. These are the intransitive endings, but are, if we compare the Aorist endings of G., more ancient than the transitive *-īṁ, -īs, -ī*. The *anusvāra* of the neuter singular terminations is probably a later device, more literary than colloquial, as final *-eṁ* is even to-day often sounded as *-a*, although in view of existing colloquial forms such as *paḍtyāt* feminine plural of *paḍtāt*, it is not necessary to assume even this.

81. It is impossible without further information to explain why M. should have adopted the present participle without the substantive verb, but if the impulse be Dr. the substantive verb would not be needed.[84] In this case we should expect to find that the M. form is much older than the G. form of the present. The absence of the nasal in the present participle suggests also

[84] An early type of K. sentence appears to be substantive-noun plus verb-noun with personal inflection, e.g., *tande baruvavanu*, the father (is) the one-who-comes, just as *tande cikkavanu*, the father is small—or the father (is) the small-one.

Dr. influence as the nasal is found in Prakrit and Sanskrit, but not in K.

§ 21. *The Aorist.*

82. In M. and G. the Aorist is an extraordinarily comprehensive tense, which is used on occasion as a substitute for all finite moods and tenses. Grammatically, it is in M. classed as an Habitual Past and in G. as an Indefinite Indicative. Actually in M. it is used as an Habitual Past, a simple Past with a negative, a present relative or subjunctive and in poetry all the tenses of the indicative mood.[85] In G. it is used as a Present, Habitual Past, relative or subjunctive, (precative and optative included), imperative and in poetry all tenses of the indicative.[86] It appears to have been adopted to express ideas only distinguished later by different forms by a primitive people who could not grasp the variety of forms that already existed to express those distinctions in Aryan.

83. K. has no form of the kind; originally it appears to have used some variety of the verb-noun. The form used as an Aorist is not one incorporating the simple verb-stem like the I.-E. Aorist, but the present or future relative participle with the verbal personal endings, e.g., *koḍuvenu* from *koḍuva* which means I give (in poetry), I habitually give and I shall give. This form which[87] does not contain the stump of the verb "to be," is much earlier than the form of the Present *koḍuttene* and may be the prototype of the M. Present. In this case it may be surmised that the I.-A. Aorist was first of all used as representing the Dr. verb-noun (employed in a flat sense for all tenses) and that when tense differences were introduced into Dr. (Query—owing to Prakrit literary influences) and revived (not on the Prakrit model) in I.-A., the use of the I.-A. Aorist was restricted, certain of the old senses surviving in poetry and in special phrases. And the fact that K. has

85 See Nav. § 611. *to bāher nighe* He used to rally forth, *to jāinā*, he refused to go, *jiv jāi toṃ paryant* till you die.

86 See Taylor § 140 and Khansaheb and Sheth § 218.

87 Some of its forms are found as early as in 600, A.D. Kittel Gram. p. 143.

no corresponding formation indicates that this portion of its verbal construction was not imitated from Aryan grammar.

§ 22. *Future Simple.*

84. Just as K. possesses no special form for Aorist, it has none for the Future. Both its Futures are really Present tenses in origin. So *māḍuvenu* and *māḍyenu* I shall make. There is, however, parallelism in a side-meaning of the Future in M. G. & K. The Future has rather the sense of "may". In European languages it expresses intention or resolution. In the Indian languages it conveys a doubt. So in G. *tame karaśo* does not express a command "you shall do," but a polite request "kindly do" and in K. *māḍyenu* means "I may make" rather than "I shall make." The M. and G. forms are purely Aryan, but they do use alternatives which suggest a Dr. idiom. The periphrases ending in *-nār -nāro* with the auxiliary verb; in G, *-āno* and M. *avayācā, ayācā* are all reminiscent of the K. (and Dr.) use of an inflected verb-noun to represent a finite verb. There is very little difference in construction between G. *huṁ javāno chuṁ* I am about to go and *nānu baruvenu* I am to go. *Javāno* is an inflected form of the verb-noun *javuṁ* and *jānār* is a future participle resembling in type *baruva*, a verb-noun used as a future or present participle.

The Sindi and Sinh. Futures formed by adding personal endings to the present participle (*vide* Bloch § 241, 243) are of a similar type.

§ 23. *The Past Tense.*

85. In M. the form of the Past Tense is participial like the Present.[88] The adjectival suffix *-lā -lī -leṁ*, etc., is added to the verb-stem and in certain simple verbs to the stem of the Prakrit past tense. G. adds the nominal or participial suffix *-o -ī -uṁ*, etc., (or *-alo*, etc., which is rare except in a participial sense) to what is identical with the absolutive participle and in certain simple verbs to the stem of the Prakrit past tense. In M. the stem of some tenses of transitive verbs ends in *-i* and is similar in form to the G. absolutive participle which does not exist in that form in M. Panjabi similarly adds the suffix *-ā*, etc., to a form identical

---

[88] See Bloch § 251, 252 for examples and discussion.

with that of its absolutive participle and Hindustani follows suit. The forms are as follows:—

M.	*mārṇeṁ*	*mārilā*	(*phirṇeṁ*	*phiralā*)
	gheṇeṁ	*ghetlā*		
G.	*karvuṁ*	*karyo*	(*kari-o*)	
		karelo	(*kari-alo*)	
		kīdho		
P.	*likhnā*	*likhiā*	(*likhī-ā*.)	
	baiṭhnā	*baiṭhā*		
H.	*girnā*.	*girā*	(*gir-ā*)	
	karnā	*kiyā*.		

The absolutive form in Hindustani is *gir* not *giri* and the stem *baiṭh* in Panjabi and Hindustani is a past-tense stem comparable with M. *ghetlā* or G. *kīdho*, but substituted for the present by derivation from the past tense.

86. In K. the past verbal participle has the same form as the G. and Panjabi -*ī* forms. K. *māḍi* G. *kari* Panj. *likhī*, and is the parent through the past relative participle of the past tense.[89] It has, however, survived only in the commonest verbs in the -*i* form and is now 'regularly' almost identical with the past relative participle. The K. verbal participle is in origin a verb-noun; it changes its form slightly in juxtaposition with another verb-noun to express co-ordination, and is transformed by the addition of -*da* into a relative participle and thence into a past tense. So *heḷu* speak, past verbal participle *hēli*, past relative participle *hēḷida*, past tense 3rd person, sing., *hēḷida* or *hēḷidanu*, the other persons being appropriately inflected. The ending -*da* is considered to be the neuter pronoun "it." There is a close connection in Sanskrit between the Gerund or Indeclinable Participle and the Past Passive Participle. The suffixes *tvā* -*tya* -*ya* are used all in the same position as the suffix of the Past Passive Participle -*tā*. Further, the Indeclinable or Absolutive Participle is a verb-noun. In Mahārāṣṭrī we find -*ūṇa* M. -*ūn* as the commonest termination of the absolutive [90] and although it is uncommonly used in Prakrit to express the infinitive,

[89] Kittel Gram. p. 137.

[90] Pischel Gram. § 586.

it is so used and has presumably produced not only the M. -*ūn* but the termination -*ūṁ* for the second M. infinitive. Now both the -*lā* and the -*ā* forms of the I.-A. past tense appear to be derived from the Sanskrit -*tā*. The change of *d to l* corresponds to that of *ḍ* to *ḷ*[91] which is more common and is a Dravidian correspondence (see § 8). The change of *t* through *d* to zero is on the other hand an Indo-European tendency. In Dr. intervocalic unvoiced stops become voiced, but there the process ceases. There is reason therefore for the northern languages to prefer the *ā* form and for the border languages M. and Oḍiya to choose the -*lā* form of Past Tense. K. does not change *d* to *l* although the use of the two forms *noḍida* and *noḍalu* for the past negative with *illa* suggest an equivalence. K. does change *ḷ* to *ḍ* under Aryan influence, but apparently not *ḷ*. We may venture to suppose that the curious Sanskrit use of an absolutive participle was suggested by its use in spoken Sanskrit and was regularised to conform to Sanskrit grammar. The Prakrit forms on the other hand would be derived from the spoken Sanskrit and operate on somewhat different principles. They do not at any rate appear to be derived from exactly the same forms as written Sanskrit. It may equally be supposed that the Sanskrit absolutive is a purely Aryan development, and its form in -*tyā* has a definite history. But it expresses an idea which can be perfectly well expressed by other alternatives, it is not an Indo-European idiom and its other forms -*tya* and -*ya* have no clear origin. If the idiom is not found in Vedic Sanskrit, its introduction from Dravidian through a Sanskrit dialect could be approximately dated. The use of the Past Tense, in I.-A., which corresponds closely with the use of the Past Tense in Dravidian (K. being taken as the type) is consistent with the view above taken.

There are three main constructions, which according to the M. terminology are called *Kartari*, *Karmaṇi* and *Bhāve*.

(*a*) The *Kartari* construction.

87 The typical form of this is Subject, Object, Active verb "I goad the ox" and it is the normal type in Aryan and Dravidian for the present tense. It is the normal type also

---

[91] cf. Pischel Gram. § 240, 244.

in Aryan and Dravidian for the Past tense, but not in I-A. except as regards a few simple primitive verbs. Even these employ not a special form of the past tense, but the Past (passive) participle. Accordingly, in M. & G. we find about thirty verbs using this construction. They denote simple mental and physical processes such as learn, say, understand, remember, bear young, bite, etc. Exx. M. *mī pāṭh śikhlā*, I learnt the lesson and with the same meaning G. *huṁ pāṭh śikhyo.*[92] There are traces of this use in other I-A. languages. With the Dravidian construction the past tense is active, as Dr. does not possess a separate passive but in case of need it cheerfully uses the past relative participle in what we should regard as a strictly passive sense, e.g., *hēḷida mātu*, the spoken word. An Indo-European mind does, however, check at this use. And this is probably why the *Karmaṇi* construction has been developed.

(*b*) The *Karmaṇi* construction.

88. According to Indo-European grammar, this construction would consist of an Agent, a Subject and a Verb in the passive voice. "A cat was seen by me." In English and, I believe, in other European languages and in Persian this construction would be exceedingly awkward but grammatical.

In M. & G. the construction is not only grammatical, but natural and the grammarian has no hesitation in calling the Agent, the subject in the agential case; the Subject, the object in the nominative case; and the Passive verb, the verb governing the object, The *kartā* and *karma*, according to the indigenous teacher, do not alter with the change of case. Consequently the English knowing Indian considers "he ate the sweetmeat" to be a verbally accurate translation of the M. *tyāneṁ barfī khāllī*[93] and "he read the lessons" similarly a word for word reproduction of G. *eṇe pāṭh vāñcyā.*[94] But that there is felt to be a certain awkwardness in the form is shown by the number of variations of it. In M. the construction is generally used only with irrational objects in the

[92] *Vide* Naval § 240, Taylor p. 68, 69.

[93] Naval § 488.

[94] Khansaheb and S. § 238.

nominative case—though we are allowed to say, *tyāneṁ mūl mārilā* [95], he killed the boy. It is probable that even in this case *mūl* is considered irrational (as in the case of the corresponding word in K.) For rational objects M. uses the Bhāve construction (see later) but G. uses the dative-accusative case of the *karma* (logical object), and the verb agrees in gender and number with it, *e.g.*, *chorie chokrāne joyo*, the girl saw the boy. This construction is also possible in M. *tyāneṁ āpalyā mulīlā śāḷeṁt pāṭhavilī*, he sent his daughter to school. There are certain popular forms in M. which indicate to what extent the past tense is regarded as Active rather than passive in voice—*tyāneṁ tyās rupaye dilen*, he gave him rupees; *tūṁ pustak vācaleṁs*, you read the book.[96] These forms are to be found in the poets so far back as *Jñāneś-var.*[97] They are therefore unlikely to be modern innovations. The quotation in Eastern Hindi made by Beames[98] from the poet Chand is an early form of this construction before it left the *Kartari* stage—*duha bāra bujhayau rāja, duja diyau na uttar kāja* ten times the King asked, the Brahman gave no answer in the matter. There is nothing to show whether *diyau* agrees with *uttar* or with *duja*. The forms are archaic and the absence of the agential case from the words *rājā* and *duja* suggest that they are regarded not only logically but grammatically as the subjects of their verbs. The *Karmaṇi* construction leads easily to the *Bhāve*, with which it has points of resemblance.

(c) The *Bhāve* construction.

89. This construction does not exist in G. In M. it is used in phrases where the object is rational, *e.g.*, *pantojīneṁ mulās phār mārileṁ*, the master beat the boy severely.[99] Old G. had the construction *śrāvakii deva pujiuṁ*, the devotee worshipped the god[100] and it can hardly be supposed that this impersonal

[95] Naval § 492.

[96] Kher § 575.

[97] Kher § 575 and Bloch § 251.

[98] II, p. 267.

[99] Nav. § 210.

[100] L. S. I. Guj. p. 300, cf. also Panj. *ur nai kuṛīāṃnuṃ saddiā hai*, he has called the girls, where *saddiā* is impersonal. E. P. Newton, Punjabi Grammar, 1898 § 69 (2).

construction is derived from the *Karmaṇi*, especially as neither G. nor M. show any particular fondness for impersonal constructions. If we look to K. we find a complete absence of this construction. The construction is however so old that it may well have preceded the *Karmaṇī* construction. It is present possibly in the Śrāvana Belgola inscription (circ. 1118) which may be quoted again from para 23. *Śrī Gaṁgarāje suttāle karaviyalem̃*. This phrase may be the *Kartari* with the verb agreeing with the object or the *Karmaṇi* with the subject not in the instrumental, but in the nominative case or the *Bhāve* with the subject in the nominative. But more than anything it resembles the K. translation *Śrī Gaṁgarājē suttāle māḍisida*, where *māḍisida* is an alternative for the inflected form *māḍisidanu* and is a verb-noun with a termination derived from a neuter pronoun. It is supposed but not known that the primitive Kanarese sentence consisted of a substantive noun and a verb-noun both uninflected for gender and that the neuter pronoun was for some reason used to represent the Past tense. Whether this device was of Dravidian origin or not, it is difficult to ascertain, but there is nothing to stand in the way of an Aryan origin. Indo-European analogies do not help us to a further extent than that passive participles may be used with an auxiliary verb to denote an indefinite Past tense, and the Romance languages show that an indefinite Past tense may be popularly used to express a finite Past. There is apparently, however, no evidence of I.-A. having used the auxiliary "to be" with any freedom and still less with a passive participle to represent a Past tense. Possibly the reason is that it has not been thought worth while to collect examples. But provisionally it may be held that I.-A. and Dr. at an early period used a neuter form of the participle as a verb-noun to express the past tense and then proceeded *pari passu* to develop each its own system of inflecting it and bringing it into line with the genius of the parent-language.

§ 24. *Passive Voice.*

90. K. has no true passive and Spencer (202) gives nine forms used as substitutes. M. has no passive and G. has a passive, which is sparingly used. It prefers periphrases. The obvious form for

M. and G. to use is the past passive participle with the copula. They did not do so because (1) the past participle was used for the past indicative (2) the copula was already employed for the foundation of the conditional clause (see para. 118).

91. Most of the periphrases in K. are paralleled in M. and G. There are three not peculiar to India.

(1) 'To feel' or 'find' etc., with a noun K. *paḍu*, feel *koḷḷu* take, *āścaryapaḍuttene* I feel surprise. The M. *pāvṇeṁ* and G. *pāmvuṁ*[101] is similarly used. In the same class may be put K. *sikku* to be found M. *miḷṇeṁ* G. *maḷvuṁ*.

(2) 'To eat' with a noun. This is a use similar to (1) but peculiar to the East. K. *tinnu*; *avanu peṭṭu tinda*, he ate blows. M. and G. has similar expressions.

(3) 'Worthy of' with a noun. K. *ī vākyavu nambatakkadu*, this word is worthy of belief, M. *pāhāvayā jogā*, G. *jovā lāyak*, both meaning 'worth seeing.'

The remaining periphrases none of which are mentioned by Spencer, are more peculiar to India.[102]

(4) The K. infinitive in *-alu*, again with *paḍu* feel or suffer, *māḍalpaḍuttēne* I am made. This form is used in old K. but is rare in modern literature (Kittel p. 325). It is probably literary only and is rarely found in the Tamil classics (Cald. p. 467). If an agent is to be expressed, the instrumental is used. This form is not found in M. & G.

(5) 'To go' with a participle. K. *hōgu*, M. *jāṅeṃ*, G. *javuṃ*. K. uses the past verbal participle, which corresponds with the absolutive participle in M. and G. So K. *wondu kuriyu kaḷedu hōyitu*, one sheep was lost. M. *to marūn gelā*, G. *te mari gayo* he died. The latter forms are not, indeed, passive, but Navalkar §305-6 gives the M.

[101] *Pāvṇeṁ* and *pāmvuṁ* mean 'to obtain' not 'to feel'. K. *paḍe* means 'to obtain' and can be used like *paḍu*. There is an obvious connexion of ideas in the three languages.

[102] This form and other passive periphrases are to be found in other languages, but I am not aiming at completeness.

expression as an alternative to the passive. The more obviously passive use is that with the past participle M. *to mārilā gelā*, G. *ā māṇas māryo gayo*, he (G. this man) was beaten. It must be noted that these phrases do not express the meaning of killing and that the phrases *mārūn ṭākilā gelā* and *māri nākhyo gayo* are never used. Therefore if *gelā* is to be used *marūn* must be the word employed. It must be noticed that the past verbal participle in K. is used in the absolutive sense as well as supplying the form for the past indicative. M. and G. use the absolutive for the intransitive verb and the past participle for the transitive verb in conformity with Aryan grammar. It is significant that G. uses not the-*lo* form, which is the more usual adjectival form of the past participle, but the-*yo* form, which is that normally used for the past tense. Similarly M. uses *-lā* and not *-lela*. It appears therefore that the use of the verb 'to go' represents an attempt to modify an active verb, rather than to supply a copula for a passive verb. The idea is so un-European that it is difficult to explain, but utilising the fact that in English also the past tense is often identical with the past participle, we can mention the phrase 'he shot went' or 'he went shot' as, though un-English, conveying a distinctly passive meaning, when compared with "he shot."

(6) 'To become' with the infinitive in various forms. This is found in K. only and not in M. or G. It is also used with a neuter participial noun, which is also a verbal noun. Exx. *Suvārteyu mārkaninda bareyalāyitu*, the gospel was written by Mark (Spencer 190) *ūṭāmāḍalāyitu* a meal was prepared. *Bareyoṇa* is also used for *bareyalu*. *Āyitu* is the past of *āgu*, become. Also *adu hēḷuvadāgide*, that has been said. The construction is probably impersonal and has an air of artificiality.

(7) 'To come' used in K. with the verb-stem form of the infinitive. *Keḷabaruttade*, it is heard (K. F. B. less. 1.) and in M. and G. with the locative of the infinitive. M.

kiti kāgad lihiṇyānt āle, how many papers have been written (Kher 344-10.), G. *ā ghar samarvāmāṁ āvśe*, this house will be repaired, *chokrāone śikhavāmāṁ āvśe*, the boys will be taught (Taylor § 74.1). In the K. example the word *keḷa* may be in the locative. In certain nominal bases the crude form is used as a locative (Kittel pp. 63, 64). But the statement by Kittel (p. 125 Remark) that the verb-noun ending in *-a* is the only one to which a locative meaning is not ascribed makes the case of *keḷa* doubtful. It is worth noting that in G. the object (and logical subject) when rational bears an accusative inflexion, but this of course does not affect the question, as in G. the verb-noun is definitely in the locative. To judge from the uses in M. and K., the G. construction is only impersonal in appearance, or perhaps, we should say, has been assimilated to an impersonal construction.

(8) The past verbal participle combined with the substantive verb (Kittel p. 329). This idiom is used impersonally only in K. *bāgalu muccide* the door is shut, *siteyannu rāmanige koṭṭitu* Sita was given to Rama. I regard this as a verbal-noun construction. That is to say *mucci* means, to shut or the shutting of and *koṭṭu* means, to give or the giving of. So—'there is a shutting of the door', etc. The past verbal participle is employed in its old sense of verbal noun.[103] This use appears to be identical with the Bhāve construction in M. (§ 23.b.), and as it is uncommon in K., was presumably suggested by it. It is, in any case, a Dr. device to express an Aryan idiom.

§ 25. *Compound Verbs.*

92. In I.-E. languages the normal method of intensifying or modifying the meaning of a simple verb is to affix a preposition or adverb. In the Indian languages the effect is obtained by the use of an intensive or auxiliary verb or of an adjective. The distinction between the uses of adverb and adjective as a complement to the verb is too fine to be discussed at the present stage;

---

[103] Kittel, p. 105.

but that between the uses of an auxiliary verb and a preposition is very definite. In all of our three languages, K. M. and G., (and indeed in all of the Indian languages, which have come to my notice) the following idiom is used. The verb to be intensified is inflected as an absolutive participle and the intensifying verb is made the principal verb. So K. *kondu hāku,* to kill, lit: killing throw, M. *mārūn ṭākṇeṁ,* G. *mārī nākhvuṁ,* to kill, lit: striking throw. Similarly K. *takkoṇḍu bā,* M. *gheūn ye,* G. *lei āv* (or *leto āv,* which is a common colloquialism) mean "fetch," but are lit: "taking or having taken come." Navalkar § 307 and Taylor § 81 give a number of such forms, the characteristic of which is that they bear a special meaning in combination. It is, however, necessary to distinguish between phrases such as *kondu hāku* with a transitive verb is principal and phrases such as *takkoṇḍu bā* with an intransitive verb as principal. In the former type the absolutive is apparently used in its old Dr. sense of a verb-noun and the compound is, in fact, a nominal compound, which is often used (as will be shown later in this section) governing the accuative case like a simple verb,—nearly always in K. and very frequently is M. and G. The latter type of phrase with an intransitive verb as principal is on a different footing. In English it can generally be translated by two co-ordinate verbs, *e.g.,* "come and bring" as well as by a verb and a preposition "bring up" or "bring along." It will be noticed that the K. phrase contains three verbs *tege, koḷḷu, baru,* remove, take, come as *takkoṇḍu* is for *tege koṇḍu.* In such cases the subordinate verb is participial and closer to the Aryan idiom.

93. Nominal compounds are used with a direct object in the accusative case (inflected or uninflected) instead of the genitive or a postpositional case. M. *tūṁ mājhe aparādh kṣamā karaśīl,* wilt thou pardon my faults? (Nav. § 116); G. *tamāro bāp tamārā aparādh paṇ māf nahi karśe,* your father will not forgive your faults also (Taylor, p. 244); K. *yēnu māṭāḍuttīri,* what are you talking about? (Ziegler p. 17). This idiom is not noticed by Navalkar and Taylor. The examples taken from their grammars are in illustration of other points of grammar. Navalkar, in fact, states (§ 295) that the object of a nominal compound is

always inflected. K., which does not distinguish seriously between the noun and the adjective or between the nominative and genitive, is indicated as the parent of this idiom. It is not, however, forgotten that a somewhat similar idiom is used in European languages, but any attempt to compare the processes of development in all parallel cases would cause the limits of this article to be exceeded.

94. There is a further interesting use of compound verbs in K. M. & G. This is, to express an action done for oneself (like the middle voice) or an action done for others, by the use of the verbs meaning 'to take' and 'to give' respectively, K. *yell' iṭṭu koṇḍalu*, where did she keep it? (Zeig. p. 30); M. *āpaṇ snān karūn ghyāveṁ*, you may finish off your ablutions. (Nav. § 307. 1, see also § 340, 4, 602-3); G. *bhai, jhaṭ nāhī le*, bathe quickly, my lad (G. F. B. lesson 7). The above are examples of "to take." Examples of "to give" are:—K. *ī kelasa nanage tōrisi kōḍiri*, teach me how to do this job (Zieg. p. 83); M. *tulā nāṇyāṃci māhitī karūn detoṃ*, I am going to give you some information about money (M. F. B. lesson 36);[104] G. *mane enī kañcaḷi karāvā āpśo*, will you have a bodice made for me out of it? (reply: *hā, kāle tāre māṭe kāñcaḷī karāviś*, yes, I will have one made for you tomorrow). In the above expressions we appear again to have the absolutive participle used as a verb-noun. The idea is perhaps clearer in K. "Where did she take the putting of it? Give me the showing of this job." Hindustani which uses the verb-root (in O. K. used as a verb-noun), as absolutive participle as well as the verb-root with-*kar* and-*ke*, uses only the verb-root in such compounds as *dedo* give up. But when intransitive verbs are used-*kar* and-*ke* are often used such as *lekar jāo*, take away.

95. This practice taken into consideration with the G. use of the present participle in such constructions with intransitive verbs supports the *a priori* theory of difference of origin of the two types of compound verbs. The transitive type (*i.e.* where the principal verb is transitive) appear to be Dr. in character

[104] A clumsy expression, but it illustrates the point.

while the "intransitive type" is of dubious origin. It may only be analogical with the transitive use, and accepted from its similarity with the Skt. absolutive. And the development even of this latter may have been materially assisted by the vernacular learning towards its use.

§ 26. *Inceptives.*

96. Neither M. nor G. particularly favour Skt. expressions for inceptive constructions. The Persian word *sharū'* in a modified form is often used. But the idiom which they possess in common with K. is quite usual and is preferred in conversation. A verb meaning "to touch (int.)" is used with the infinitive. M. *to cālūṁ lāgalā*, he began to walk (Nav. § 310); G. *loko dhujvā lāgyā*, people began to tremble (Tayl. § 89); K. *nīvu aḷahattidāga*, when you began to cry (K. F. B. Lesson 10). Here *aḷa* is an infinitive of *aḷu* to weep: *hattu*, like *lāg*,—means "to touch." The O.K. form *pattu*, (found also in Tel.) appears not to have the meaning of "begin." It is therefore not possible to suggest an origin.

§ 27. *Impersonal Verbs.*

97. The difference between the I.-E. and the Dr. impersonal verbs is superficially slight. Both types of language have a verb-noun as subject to a defective verb. For example in Latin *nec lusisse pudet* nor am I ashamed to have played. But *me piget* I am annoyed, introduces a different type of impersonal verb, which is not found in Dr. In both the above cases the impersonal verb can be parsed as the 3rd Pers. Sing. Pres. Ind. Act. The oldest type of impersonal verb in K. cannot be parsed thus: *bēku* it is necessary, *sāku* it is enough, are verb-nouns in origin, afterwards used as a present indicative. *Bahudu, barutte, baruttade* with the negatives *beḍa*, *salla*, *bāradu* are other varieties. The K. scheme of an impersonal phrase is to begin as if for an ordinary phrase, but, instead of using a transitive verb, to use the impersonal verb with its subordinate verb. For example *nānu hōguttene* I am going; *nānu hoga bēku* I must go. It is probable that *nānu hōguttene* has replaced an old phrase such as *nā hoga* I going whence *ṇā hoga bēku* I going is necessary would naturally follow. The inflexions are later additions, -*nu* is added to *nā*

I, forming *nānu*; the ending *-ene* is added to *hōgutta*, the verb noun to form *hōguttene*. And as, from the Dr. point of view, a personal termination is merely added to the verb-noun to make the allusion more definite, there is no reason why the personal termination should not be added to *bēku*. This, however, is not done, but *beḍiri* is found as the 2nd Pers. Plur. of *beḍa*, it must not be.

98. M. and G. do not follow this line of development. Their impersonal verbs are, however, antiquated in form. In M. *pāhije* and G. *joie*, it is necessary, the obsolete passives of the verb "to see" in the sense of "to desire"[105] are used (of Hindustani, *cāhiye*). In G. *jovuṃ* no longer means "to desire" but the M. *pāhaṇeṁ* still possesses this meaning. There is nothing surprising in the use of the word "see" in the meaning of "desire" (look for) and the construction of these impersonal phrases is in accordance with Aryan idiom. But its use as an impersonal is unusual, especially when the sense of "desire" is expanded into that of "necessity." There is a corresponding idiom in colloquial Hindustani, which grammarians refuse to recognise. The word "*mā̃ṅgtā*" means "I, (thou), (he) ask (s) for," but is used in the sense of *cāhiye*, it is necessary. We find (in the Bombay variety of Hindustani) the phrases "*do lakrī mā̃ṅgtā* "I want two sticks", *kyā mā̃ṅgtā* "what do you want?," or "what does she want?" In these phrases *mā̃ṅgtā* is exactly equivalent to *cāhiye*. This idiom corresponds with the M. and G. development of the meaning of "desire" into "necessity" and with the K. use of a verb-noun or participle for the present impersonal verb. No emphasis need be laid upon the latter use. The correspondence may be accidental. It is curious that the Bombay Presidency speakers of Hindustani, who are either Gujaratis or Marathas, should not have adopted *cāhiye*, seeing that there is a corresponding idiom *joie* or *pāhije* in their languages. It may be that the idiom is due to European influence, but I have never found any European habitually using the phrase who knew that a verb *mā̃ṅgnā* 'to ask for' existed.

99. There is another point of contact between the M., G. and K. uses. *Pāhije* and *joie* mean "is seen." The K. *bēku* is a con-

[105] On the identity of "to see" and "to desire" in I.-A., *Vide* Block, Voir en Indoaryen *Fest-schrifte Wackernagel*, p. 147.

traction of *beḍku* O. K. *bēḻku, bēḻ* to desire, entreat.[106] In I.-A. the senses of "desire" and "see" are irregular and distributed among the four or five words meaning "to see"[107] and the Sanskrit original may mean "to see" or "to desire" or both in its later vernacular stage. The Dr. forms appear to have been in the beginning separate. There is the root *bēḻ* to desire and the root *bēg*, spy, see. *Bēku* is credited by Kittel in his Dictionary with a doublet *behu*, which is also a doublet of *bēgu*. Te. has *vēgu* to watch and *vēcu* to watch, expect, hope, wish for. A fuller search may lead to the discovery of more alternatives in Dr. languages, but in K. *bēku* is the sole means of expressing want, desire, necessity, either singly or with another verbs. In M. and G., on the contrary, *joie* and *pāhije* though the usual forms are not the only methods of expressing the sense. There is unfortunately no possibility of proof as the evidence now is, but I would advance the following theory of development. Pr. Dr. had a form *beḻku, beḻ* or *vēḻku, vēḻ* to see, desire. For such doublet, compare *nālku nāl* four in K. (*nāl* being colloquial). This form split into K. *bēḍku, bēku* desire and *bēgu* see, Ta. *veṇḍu* desire, Te. *vēḍu* desire, *vēgu* watch, *vecu* expect, Tu. *vēḍu* desire. The K. *nōḍu* see, does not mean 'desire' though it has the meaning of "expect." The Pr. Dr. meanings of *bēḻ*, influenced the Skt. words meaning "to see" and Skt. in turn induced the separation of the forms of *bēḻku* to correspond with the different meanings. If this view is correct the process took place long before our earliest Dr. records.

100. To a logical mind the use of *pāhije joie* and *bēku* as a simple impersonal with the addition of a copula in the past tense to indicate past necessity would seem sufficient. But all the languages M. G. and K. seem to have been possessed with a restless desire to inflect. The inflexions of M. and G. like those of K. are often signs of a need for greater exactness of expression, which M. and G. declined to inherit from their ancestor and which was never possessed by prim. Dr. for K. to inherit. We find therefore that G. is not satisfied with

[106] Ta. *véṇḍu*, Te. *véḍu*, Tu. *beḍu*.

[107] Bloch—Voir en Indo-Aryen.

joie, as a kind of inarticulate slang phrase, but treating it as a 3rd Pers. Sing. of the Present (Aorist), creates the forms *joie che*, *joiśe* (Fut.), *joito* (Pres. Part.) and *joiat* (Cond.) (Taylor § 66) The negative is *nahi joie* or *joito nathī*. M. has *pāhije hotoṁ*, I was wanted, *mī pāhije*, I am (shall be) wanted and inflects the verb not timidly like K. but with complete boldness, by means of personal endings, e. g., *tuṁ pāhijes*, *te pāhijet*, *mī pāhije*, *to pāhijel* (Naval. § 264.) The cause of this inflexion is due to the revival of grammatical feeling probably coincident with the recognition of M. as a language and the beginnings of the growth of a Maratha unity. So too with Gujarati.

101. The negatives run on different lines. M. has *nako* is not wanted, do not—, with inflected forms *nakos*, *nakā*, *nakot* (Nav. § 266 admits only *nakot*, but admits other forms § 268 and Kher p. 236 gives all three forms). *Nako* is quite consistently derived from *na* and *kar* to do. However *kāhīṁ nako* does not mean 'do not do anything' but " I don't want any." According to the present use " do not do " is a derived meaning not the original and *karūṁ nako* is far more easily explained as " doing is unnecessary " than as "do not do doing." Is *nako* therefore derived from some other root than *kar* ? That conclusion is unnecessary. But it does appear that a people not speaking any A. tongue, but having to communicate with A. speakers, took the word *nako*—do not—as an expression equivalent to *bēḍa*—it is unnecessary —with a derived use " do not " and used it in much the same way as *bēḍa* as an absolute verb noun. The similarity of the endings of *nako* with that of *bēku* and *sāku* may have made the adoption of *nako* easier.

102. Possibility is expressed in M. by the verb *yeṇeṃ* to come generally impersonally, *e.g.*, *malā cāltīṁ yeteṁ*, I am able to walk. The negative is *yet nāhiṁ*, the forms *nayc*, *nayet* being used to express the meaning ought not, should not. G. has neither of these uses, but K. uses *baru* " come " in the meaning of " be able " as *nanage ōdalikke baruttade*, I can read,[108] *ōda baruvadilla*, I cannot read, *tereya barada kaṇṇu* an eye which

[108] Kittel Grammar, p. 338.

cannot open.[109] Spencer gives this third example to illustrate *baru* in the meaning of "understand." These uses are impersonal, but Spencer notes that in conversation they are used personally. To correspond with the M. *naye*, ought not, there is K. *bahudu*, it is proper, with its negative *bāradu* ; *nānu bareya bahudu*, I may write, and *avaru hīge mātanāḍabāradu*,[110] they must not speak thus. Both forms are derived from *baru*, come. The M. *naye* is similar to *nako* being the negative imperative. But it never means "do not come." *Nako* is a curt refusal to accept or to allow, *naye* is a piece of advice. The loss of the root meanings of both is due probably to the inability of Dr. speakers of A. to distinguish between the ideas of "do not" and "not needed", of "come" and "may" respectively. The adoption of these two words in M. is probably prior to the stabilisation of *pāhije* as a definite impersonal verb.

103. The word "yes" in the three languages is an impersonal form of the verb "to be." The negative "no" is similarly, the negative impersonal of the same verb. "Yes." M. *hoy* (vulg. *ho* pron. *hɔ̄*), G. *hā* (vulg. *hove*), K. *houdu*, O. K. *aha*. "No" M. *nāhīṃ*, G. *nahi*, K. *illa*. All the positive forms are derived from roots A. *bhu-*, Dr. *āg*,[111] the primary meanings of which are "become" ; the negative forms are however derived from roots meaning "exist" A. *as* Dr. *il*. The I.-E. tendency appears to favour the use of an adverb or pronoun and it may be observed that most people who first come into contact with an alien language prefer to use a positive or negative verb rather than a simple adverb. It is impossible to refer to prim. Dr. forms and therefore it cannot be said whether the K. form is or is not a mere imitation of the I.-A. forms. It may be, but at the same time those I.-A. forms may have been due to a Dr. impulse.

S. 28. *The Verb "to be" and its negative.*

104. Apart from its uses as an affirmative and negative adverb the verb "to be" has peculiarities in India. In late Skt. the absence of the verb "to be" from sentences was normal,

109 Spencer, p. 229.

110 Spencer, p. 123, 128.

111 Kittel Grammar, p. 117.

especially in phrases containing an interrogative, relative or demonstrative pronoun and to a marked extent in those containing a participle. Dr. Bloch (§ 266, 268) considers that in M. the sentence has in this respect, as in others perceptibly passed the stage of late Skt. The question arises 'Why did Skt. take this turn of development?' The obvious reply seems to be not that it was a natural tendency of Indo-Aryan or Indo-European nor that it was somehow due to the climate, but that the language was influenced by the fact that those using it were employing for conversational purposes a different idiom, and that this idiom was an idiom of the soil. The absence of the verb 'to be' is even more common in K. than in M. G. and unless we adopt the wholly untenable position that the Dr. languages were not prior to the Aryan languages in occupation of India, we cannot escape the conclusion that the idiom was definitely Dr. before it helped to form what is known as Indo-Aryan. Instances of the absence of the verb "to be" are M. *jetheṁ gāṁv, tetheṁ mahārvāḍā*, where there is a village there is a Mahārvādā *tujheṁ nāṁv kāy*, what is your name? (given by Dr. Bloch); G. *deś tevo veś* as is the country, so the garb; *tamāruṁ nām śuṁ*, what is your name? K. abounds with instances. In Ziegler's Practical Key p. 73-75, there are thirty-nine phrases with only twenty finite verbs of which four alone are forms of the verb "to be". Even phrases like "You do a good deal of work" do not follow the European model or the I.-A. model which in this respect is I.-E., but we have *nīvu māḍuvantha kelasa bahaḷa*, the work which you do is much. The copula is practically non-existent in K.

105. The negative of the verb "to be" in M. is *nāhīṁ* used as a negative adverb as well as *na* which is rare except before the aorist. In K. there is *illa* (*alla*) only and in G. *nathi* used also as a negative adverb, *nahi* and *na* or *nā* being also used as such, but never as verbs. M. inflects *nāhīṁ* as in *nāhīṁs, nāhīṁt*. K. has a form *illari* or *illiri*, but this is apparently equivalent to G. *nājī* and means "no sir". K. has like other Dr. languages no negative adverb proper. It expresses the negative by means of a device which Dr. Bloch has termed the zero negative and only in connection with verbs. The root of the verb is simply inflected with the

personal termination. Several explanations of this idiom have been attempted, but none are satisfactory. The two K. forms *illa*, *alla* are derived by Kittel from *il* = *ir*, to be and *al*, to be fit. These derivations cannot be considered as more than hypothetical. The vocalic alternations of *adu*, *idu* this, that, *intha antha*, such as this, such as that suggest a pronominal derivation like that of the French *oui* (*oc*). Both these forms are invariable and it is permissible to suppose that they never represented the negative of the copula, because there was no copula. However they are used to represent "does not exist," *alla* being more common in this sense and there is nothing in theory to prevent them being forms of the negative verb. The M. and G. forms of the negative verb, were undoubtedly originally conjugable and M. has gone through a strange transformation in allowing the form to become fixed for all persons (like the English present tense in dialect) and then to have awoken to a sense of inflexion. I am inclined to attribute the first phase to Dr. influence during the adoption of the A. language by Dr. and the second to the Brahmans' revival of the study of Skt. in their successful effort to combat Buddhism and Jainism. Gujarat has never felt the Brahman influence so much as Mahārāṣtra and her grammar does not therefore march with M. grammar.

Chapter IX.

SYNTAX

§ 29. *Order.*

106. It is stated in L.S.I. Drav. p. 281 that the order of words in modern I.-A. Vernaculars with the governed word before the governing word and the verb invariably at the end of the sentence is also in accordance with Dr. principles. That idiom except so far as it is found in the use of postpositions is not, however, peculiar to Indian languages. The examples given for M. by Dr. Bloch § 273 foll. represent an idiom far more peculiar to Dr. The most salient features of this idiom are (1) the position of the indirect before the direct object M. *Rāmāneṁ sadūlā āmbā dilā*, Rama gave a mango to Sadu (Nav. § 499);

G. *teṇe gopālne soṭī mārī*, he struck Gopal a cane-blow (Tay. § 132). K. *ī yettu nanage bahaḷa kaṣṭa kōḍuttade*, this bullock gives much trouble (Zieg. p. 60); (2) the position of the interrogative whether subject or object just before the principle verb. M. *tujhī āī koṇ āhe, mulī*, who is your mother, little girl, *tyānem koṇācā aparādh kelā*, against whom has he offended? [112] G. *pāṇī na hoy to āpaṇe śum pīe*, if there is no water, what are we to drink? (Tayl. p. 224). K. *ī annā yēnu māḍidi*, what have you done to this rice (Zieg p. 86). It is to be noted that *aparādh kelā* the second example M. is considered as one expression and I am not sure that *koṇālā* instead of *koṇācā* would not be more generally used. Phrases like *aṁ, koṇ hāk māritem*, Oh, who is calling? are similarly no exception to the rule. I believe that this order is due to the tendency to omit the copula. *Tujhī āī koṇ*, is commoner than *tujhī āī koṇ āhe* and the commonest form of question is that involving a copula explicit or implied. If the copula is implied, necessities of intonation require that the interrogative should be placed at the end of the sentence. The use of the word "whatever" for "what" in English and "*qu'est-ce que*" for "*que*" in French indicate that the difficulty is felt to some extent even when a copula is regularly used.

107. The interrogative pronoun neuter is used in M. G. and K. to denote a question at the end of a sentence. M. *āj pāūs paḍel kāy*, will rain fall to-day?; G. *tame jāo cho śuṃ*; K. *avar' iruttār' ēnu*, are they at home? G. also has *śuṁ tame jāo cho*, but to the best of my recollection this is only an expression of surprise and expects the answer "Yes". K. has besides *yēnu* the forms *-ā* and *-ō*, as *avar' iruttārō*. These forms appear to be older than *yēnu* in this particular usage. It is possible that *yēnu* is a translation of *kāy* or *śuṃ*, which are in their turn, means of representing the Dr. *-ā* and *-ō* which had no parallel in Aryan.

108. The above idioms are found like many others in the majority, if not all, Indian languages *e.g.*, Hindustani—Tamil. One of them, the late position of the interrogative is also found in Persian, but this fact is capable of an entirely independent explanation, which will not affect Indian.

---

112 Naval. § 571, 572.

§ 30. *Subordination.*

109. The interesting point brought out by Dr. Bloch §. 276. that M. hardly recognises any subordinate sentences except those of a relative character or introduced by a relative adverb recalls vividly to the mind the fact that the scheme of Dr. subordination is based entirely upon the relative participle. In Dr. the sentence-type is that of the verb-noun, the substantive-noun and the adjective-noun linked up by apposition or proximity in an invariable order. Logical subordination is marked very frequently, says Dr. *Bloch by some kind of parataxis.* Such a parataxis fails to express a sequence of cause and effect and even to express a sequence of time with accuracy. In prim. Dr., apparently, past and present were barely distinguished and different stages of time were not demarcated. The order of the sentence alone served sometimes to indicate that two actions expressed by two verbs were not contemporaneous. One of the most notable instances of this lack of exactness in expressing time is the use of the absolutive participle in all three languages. The following examples will make this point clear, if we consider the M. and G. verbs therein to represent Dr. verb-nouns with a past-sense. The M. (*a*) *to asem̐ bolūn gelā* thus he spoke and went; (*b*) *bhet hoūn varṣa loṭlem̐*, since we met a year has passed. G. (*a*) *cokro joine hasvā maṇḍī gayo*, the boy looked and began to laugh; (*b*) *vādaḷ khullum̐ thai taḍko paḍyo hato*, the clouds having cleared the sun shone forth. K. (*a*) *salām māḍi hōdaru* they saluted and went away, (*b*) *avanu hōgi eidu divasa āyitu*, it is five days since he went. The first impulse is to treat the construction as merely that of a participle and verb so usual in I.-E. But this will not do. The absolutive participle is not definitely present or past in tense, active or passive in voice, infinite or finite in mood. The theory of *parataxis* is necessary, for the absolutive participle is not even always absolute. But the underlying construction is M. (*a*) he so spoke went, (*b*) meeting happened, year lapsed, (*a*) boy looked, laughing began, went (*b*) clouds cleared, sun shone; K. (*a*) salute made, went, (*b*) he went, five days passed. The close connection of all these phrases is evident. M. (b) and K. (*b*) are especially parallel. They are all informed with one idiom and that not Aryan.

110. Dr. Bloch has also noticed the anaphorical *heṁ* or *aseṁ* in M. to pick up one or more subjects. This idiom is not common in G. and unknown in K. and is probably due to a grammatical revival such as produced other phenomena peculiar to M. The anaphorical use of *heṁ, teṁ, aseṁ* M. and *e, te, evuṁ, em* G. is on the other hand an exceedingly usual way of expressing indirect speech or a substantival sentence. The use of *ke* "that" is a pure Persian idiom which has been adopted in books under Muhammadan or European influence and is never used conversationally. Therefore, if we wish to express "he heard that Rama had gone", we say naturally in M. *Rāmā gelā aseṁ tyāneṁ aikleṁ* or in G. "she knew that his mind was injured" *tenuṁ man bagaḍī gayuṁ e* (*nī*) *tene khabar hati.*[113] K. uses *idu*; *nīnu nannannu jareyutti idu sariyalla* thou dost despise me this is not right, *i.e.*, it is not right that you should despise me. It does not use *intha* or *antha* such, although *hīge* and *hāge* thus are used, *e.g.*, *iddu hāge heḷu*, tell me what happened (Zieg. p. 25). But this omission is only apparent as will be explained in the next paragraph. This anaphorical use is merely another phase of the *parataxis* mentioned in para. 109. Instead of placing verb-nouns in apposition, sentence-nouns are placed in apposition. But in such long phrases confusion must be avoided and an anaphorical pronoun or adverb is inserted between the two phrases. And here again we see G. which uses an adverb, in closer agreement with K. than M. which does not. This fact is probably due to the absence of a movement for grammatical reform in Gujarat similar to that carried out by the Marāṭhā paṇḍits.

111. *Mhaṇūn* M. has an extraordinary substitute for *heṁ* and *aseṁ*, which is not found in other I.-A. languages. It is *mhaṇūn* saying or having said. Phrases like "I will fetch a knife, so saying he went off" or "I will fetch a knife, saying, he went off" are the natural Indian counterparts of English phrases such as "saying (that) he would fetch a knife, he went off." But the types "I will come he saying said" (he said that he would come) and "She came saying he went away"

113 Tay. p. 118 has *tenuṃ man bagḍeluṃ che evuṃ te jāṇatī hatī*, which is grammatically correct, but stiff.

(he went away because she came) are less easily comprehensible. The former type we find with different words used for "say" in the Bible "The Lord spoke unto Moses saying...." but M. can use the same word for both, *e.g.*, *mīṁ tujhe gharīṁ yeīn mhaṇūn mhaṇ ālā*, he said that he would come to your house.[114] The latter type is peculiar to M. and the Dr. languages. There are said to be similar uses in Nepālī and Tibeto-Burman, but a superficial search reveals no exact parallels. K. uses the words *enta*, *anta*, *endu* which are identified as participles of the verbs *ennu* and *annu* 'say.' So we find *illavanta hēḷidaru*. (*illa anta hēḷidaru*) they said that it was not.[114a] Kittel (Gram. p. 108, 141) finds these forms *enta* and *anta* puzzling and gives two alternative explanations neither of which are satisfactory. If, however, we suppose that the M. idiom is a translation of the Dr. idiom it is easy to understand. The idiom can be reduced to a form of *parataxis*, which is the Dr. method of expressing subordination and both *mīṁ yeīn mhaṇ ūn mhaṇālā* and *illavanta hēḷidaru* can be resolved into the sentences—" I will come, saying said" and "It is not, speaking they said." We miss, however, the anàphorical pronoun which is an essential part of such *parataxis*. The need for such a pronoun recalls the fact that in K. *enta* and *anta* are used colloquially for *intha* and *antha*, the original forms being *intaha*, *entaha*, *antaha* (Kittel Gram. p. 188). The aspirated letters are not a proper Dr. feature. Spencer (p. 214, note 1) states that in the expression *illavanta hēḷidaru*, the -*ta* is frequently aspirated (incorrectly) making *illavantha*. It seems probably therefore that *enta* and *anta* are not contractions of *ennutta* and *annutta* the present participles of *ennu* and *annu*, but the pronouns used anaphorically. In Tam. and Tel. the corresponding forms lack the aspirate element (Cald. p. 431). They are subject to the same confusion with verbs of saying. It appears therefore that the Dravidians in primitive times used the anaphorical construction only for *oratio obliqua*; the construction of the type " he speaking went" or " he spoke, went" was also commonly used and when two words such as *anta anutta* continually come into juxtaposition there is a natural

[114] Nav. § 357 4 Note 2.

[114a] Spencer, p. 214.

tendency for one to be omitted. The idiom may also be illustrated from Tam. *eṉṟu śoṉṉāṉ* said that (L. S. I. Drav. 316) and from Tel. *ani ceppenu*, they said so, as compared with *ceppen-anenu*, speaking said (L. S. I. Dr. 592, 593). In the Tel. examples *ani* is an adverb and *anenu* a verb, the roots being homonyms. The above explanation is, of course, merely speculative as the historical evidence does not reach back far enough to afford verification. It appears, however, to account for the almost complete identity of *aseṁ* and *mhaṇūn* as used in *oratio obliqua* in M. The phrase *oratio obliqua* is not accurate, as Indian languages use a direct construction, but it conveniently represents an idiom which would be translated in Latin by *oratio obliqua*.

112. *Mhaṇūn* is used as has been stated above, to mark a causal clause. It is in this connection usually translated as "therefore"—*tethīl ghareṁ sukīṁ āhet mhaṇ ūn, aśīṁ śahareṁ phār thoḍīṁ asatīl*, there must be very few such cities because the houses there are dry. This is parallel to the G. use of *māṭe e.g., huṁ māndo chuṁ māṭe moḍo āvyo*, I have come late because I am ill (Taylor § 118). The derivation of *māṭe* is uncertain. It might be expected to have some connection with a verb of saying. It resembles superficially both M. *mhaṇṇeṃ* and K. *mātu* a word. But evidence is lacking. The K. expression has "*endu*" (past verbal participle of *ennu* say)—*avaru nammannu huḍuki baralillavendu manege hōdaru*, they sought us and went home because we did not come (Spencer, p. 216). It will be noticed that this sentence is grammatically obscure according to the Indian idiom. It is the method of juxtaposition of ideas not the grammatical structure that makes the meaning clear. *Endu* here cannot stand for *idu* or *intha*. The literal translation—They having searched for us went home saying "not come."—is primitive, but intelligible. *Mhaṇūn*, however, is used in a way which indicates that the phrase is stereotyped and no longer represents a living idiom. In K. according to Spencer, the construction with "*endu*" is only used when it is understood that the reason given is subjective and not necessarily accepted by the writer. Navalkar (§ 357.4) seems also to hold this view for *mhaṇūn*, but its actual use does not support his theory. In K. *emba* yet another variation (we

have had *enta* and *endu*) and a third form of the verb-noun is used in certain phrases. *Emba* (from *ennuva*) is the present relative participle, *enta* is the present verbal participle and *endu* is the past relative participle. *Emba* is used to express a statement implicit in a noun—*emba saṁśaya*, the doubt that.

113. Another use of *mhaṇūn* is similar to one of the uses of *mhaṇje*—that is or so called. *Isāk mhaṇūn Ābrāhāmācā putra hotā*, there was a son of Abraham called Isaac (Nav. § 357). *Mhaṇūn* is here clearly used as a passive, an idiom common to Dravidian. K. has *emba* (see previous para)—*muddanembavanobba huḍugaviddanu*, there was a boy named Mudda (K.S.B. lesson 9). The sentence may be analysed thus "Mudda call he one boy existed, he." The phrase suggests a development from the particular to the general, from the climax to the anticlimax contrary to the European idiom. This turn of phrase is also clear in the M. sentence, the last word of which is translated first in English and so on until the first word is reached which is translated last.

114. The uses of *mhaṇje* fall mainly under this section and it is convenient to deal with them all together. *Mhaṇje* is a passive form like *pāhije*. It has lost its verbal construction and is now an adverb only. Its meanings correspond closely with G. *eṭale* and K. *andare*. Examples will be given below. There is no obvious connection between *mhaṇje*, a pres. ind. passive *eṭale*, a pronominal adverb and *andare*, a relative past participle with a conditional participle affixed. The conventional line of explanation is to compare *eṭale* with the Arabic *ya'ni*, which undoubtedly is used in Hindustani and has had some influence, while *mhaṇje* is explained on *a priori* grounds and *andare* accepted as natural to the Dr. tendency of language. But there is, in fact, a close connection between the three expressions—capable indeed only of *a priori* demonstration, but likely to lead further than any other theory. Let us proceed to the examples, first, illustrating the meaning of "then" indicating a temporal sense often with a causal implication. M (1) *tumhi bolalāṁ mhaṇje mājheṁ kārya hoīl*,[115] should you speak, then indeed my business is done; (2) *to ālā*

115 Nav. § 357. 5 Note 2.

mhaṇje malā sāṅg, tell me as soon as he comes.[115a] G. *huṁ uṭhyo eṭale te nikaḷyo*, he went away immediately I rose up.[115b] K. *nīnu nannannu baḍyalikke bā andare ninna meimēle haridu baruvadu*, if you go to beat me, then it will rush at you. *It* refers to a dog. The literal translation of the K. sentence is "come you to beat me, if it be said, it will come rushing on your body." Now both in the M. and the K. the meaning of "say" is inappropriate. The G. *eṭale* 'at so much' is much clearer. The M. idiom *aseṁ asatāṁ* and the G. idiom *em chatāṁ*, 'this being so,' indicate that *eṭale* is the more natural expression. The K. expression shows all the signs of an A. idiom being adapted to Dr. use. We have similar awkward idioms in which the form of the A. relative sentence is rendered by an interrogative and demonstrative in K. But there is a K. form *anitu* which is equivalent to *aṣṭu* (O.K. *aṭṭu*) so much, as well as the *antu* above mentioned. It seems probable therefore that in the original Dr. idiom temporal-conditional-causal sentences (for the sentences quoted above can be considered as any of these types) were put in *parataxis* with the principal sentence and separated by a locative dem. pronoun. This was considered at an early date as the relative participle of the verb "to say" and translated into M. (or Prakrit) by the Passive Indicative, which the relative participle represented in certain cases owing to its flavour of the past tense and then settled down as an invariable particle before M. Grammar began to be regulated. The G. form then, as it often does, represents the Dr. idiom more directly than the M. form. There is a G. form *eṭlāmāṁ* meanwhile, which corresponds with the M. *itkyānt* and the K. *aṣṭaralli*. The M. form is not so common (to the best of my recollection) as the G. and K. and I am only able to cite the G. and K. authorities (Taylor § 118 and Ziegl. p. 46) for instances of this use. The words mean "in so much" and its use is clearly parallel to the idiom, which has been suggested as the original form of *mhaṇje, eṭale* and *andare*.

115. *Mhaṇje* also means, 'namely'. It is not used quite like *mhaṇūn*, more like Hindustani *ya'nī*. So M. *aśva mhaṇje ghoḍā*,

---

115a Nav. § 672.

115b Tayl. § 118.

"*aśva* means a horse",[116] G. *aśva eṭale ghoḍo*, K. *aśva andare kudure*. Here the M. expression seems the most logical. The G. word seems an imitation of *ya'nī* and the K. expression so far as it possesses a conditional sense is inappropriate. Kittel gives old K. examples employing *endu* and *andu* instead of *andare*[117] and I am inclined to think that we have in K. the relative past participle used in the sense of present indicative passive. To revert to a former example *Muddanembavanu*; if we split it up we find *Mudda emba avanu* 'he called Mudda', exactly parallel in construction with ' horse called *aśva* (replacing *andare* by *andu*). Only the present relative participle is used in the place of the past relative participle. How then to account for *eṭale*. Simply thus. G. has chosen the pronoun to represent the verb in this phrase, incorrectly just as M. and K. have chosen incorrectly the verb to represent the pronoun in other uses of *mhaṇ ūn*, *mhaṇje* and *andu*, *endu*.

§ 31. *Relative and cognate clauses.*

116. The theory of the Dr. substratum of idiom in M. and G. has been sufficiently developed in the preceding sections and it will be necessary only to give examples of parallel constructions.

M. *mī patra lihileṁ, teṁ āleṁ*. the letter which I wrote has arrived. G. *meṁ patra lakhyuṁ, te āvi gayuṁ*. K. *nānu bareda kāgadavu sēritu*. As regards the M. and G. constructions it is usually supposed that the relative pronoun or adverb is missing (Bloch § 276, Taylor Gram.) But colloquially it is never used and the sentence is actually divided into two parts *mī patra lihileṃ teṃ —āleṁ*, *meṁ patra lakhyuṁ te—āvi gayuṁ*, wherein the whole phrase ending with *teṁ* or *te* is considered the subject of the verb. It is at that point that the orator makes his pause. A halting G. speaker will often interpose the words *chhe te* " this is what it is" to fill in the time while he is thinking of something to say. In the K. sentence there is no doubt. Relative pronouns are unknown.[118]

---

116 Naval § 357, 5 Note 1.

117 Grammar, p. 355.

118 Cf. Bloch § 276. " The anaphoric particle in the principal clause cannot be omitted."

117. Temporal clauses are a variety of relative clause M. *pāṭh vāñcitos tevhāṁ, bais*, G. *pāṭh vāñce tyāre, bes*, K. *pāṭhagaḷannu oduv-āga kudru*—all mean "when you read your lesson(s) sit down." I have punctuated the M. and G. sentences in the proper way. The relative may be used but is quite unimportant. The temporal adverb is not so much anaphorical, although the term is a most convenient one, as postpositional. *Tevhāṁ* and *tyāre* really represent *āga*, which is a verb-noun meaning "happen, become." The analysis in K. in thus 'lessons-reading' as a phrase, a verb-noun; 'happen' another verb-noun; and 'sit-down' yet another. You therefore have three verb-nouns—the first infinite or indefinite awaiting completion, the second completing the first but needing completion by a third word and the third closing and completing the sentence. There is in fact a *parataxis* of three phrases welded into one by contiguity and order.

118. Conditional clauses are expressed in a similar fashion. M. *aseṁ āhe tar, mī khacit yeīn* if it is so, I shall certainly come,[119] *to mumbaīhūn ālā asalā tar, laukar malā sāṅg*, should he have arrived from Bombay, let me know instantly.[120] *Asalā* is morphologically the past tense of *asaṇeṁ* to be, although never used as such.[121] *Asato*, etc., the corresponding present form is also used much in the same sense. G. besides the construction *te āve to, khabar āpo*, tell me if he comes, uses the verb 'to be' *jo tene coksaī karī hot, to āvo vakhat āvataj nahi*[122] had he made careful enquiry such a crisis would certainly not have occurred. *Āvat* corresponds in form with M. *asato*, but is never used in the present tense. K. uses *-re* added to the past relative participle, *e.g.*, *avanu bandare nānu haṇa koḍuvenu* if he comes I will give him money.[123] The derivation of the termination *-re* is uncertain, it descends from O. K. *aḍe, oḍe*, but Kittel connects it with *uḷ* to be.[124] This use of the

119 M. T. B. lesson 2.

120 Naval § 626.

121 The expression appears to be due to a feeling that the introduction of the verb "to be" better indicates a condition. See latter part of the paragraph.

122 Tayl § 142 d.

123 Spencer p. 140.

124 Grammar p. 319.

verb "to be" would be parallel to the use of *āga*, become, for temporal clauses and to the G. and M. uses of the same verb to express doubt or uncertainty, as in the G. expression *karī hot* above. Caldwell points out that a form of the substantive verb to express a condition is common to all Dr. dialects and that the word *āgu* become or some form of it may be used to express a conditional or a concessive sense.[125]

119. Concessive clauses are expressed in K. in the same way as conditional clauses but with the addition of the emphatic enclitic -*ū*. M. and G. use a similar device *tarī* from *tar* and *toe, to paṇ* from *to*. This practice appears A. in origin and we find it in Greek *kai ei* and Latin *etiamsi*.

We have found that the type of construction of subordinate phrases in M. and G. is that of the relative clause in Dr. It is distinctly un-A. in character although it can be forced into the A. mould. It is not only relative or temporal constructions with a correlative to suggest a vanished relative pronoun or adverb that follow the Dr. idiom. In M. there are sentences such as *mī yeiṁ paryant tyālā vāṭ pāhaṇyās sāng*—tell him to wait for me till I come;[126] *mī rupaye ghetlyāvāncūn jāṇār nāhīṁ*. I will not go without taking the rupees;[127] G. *śuṁ evuṁ karyāne lidhe teo mane kāḍi to nahi muke?* Will they not cast me out for having done so?[128] Such sentences emphasize the affinity of the M. and G. constructions with the Dr. relative participle clause.

120. *Oḍiya* which is a language occupying much the same position *vis à vis* Tel. as M. does *vis à vis* K. actually possesses a relative participle formed by adding to the past verbal participle the terminations *bā* for the present and *lā* for the past tense. *Mu dəbā dhāna*, the corn which I give and *mu dəlā ṭaṅkā* the rupee which I gave.[129] The forms are the more interesting because they suggest the K. -*va* and -*lu* and the G. -*lo* and -*lā* which are all except the K. -*lu* participle in origin. In K.

---

125 p. 525, 526, 527.

126 Quoted by Dr. Bloch, § 276.

127 Nav. § 658.

128 Tayl. 149b.

129 Maltby, Odiya language, p. 25.

-va is the sign of the pres. relative participle, while the past relative participle is almost identical with the past verbal participle (not however a *-lu* form but *-du* or *-tu*). As denoting the past the K. *-lu* is only used in the negative *e.g.*, *nānu nōḍalilla* have not seen. In Mysore *nōḍidilla* is preferred *i.e.*, the past relative participle with *illa*. The curious similarity of the *-d* and *-l* forms in the K. negative verb with the *-d*, *-t* and *-l* forms in the M. and G. past tenses should be noted. It is possible that the *-d*, *-t* form is A and the *-l* form Dr. in origin (cf. para 86). The relative participle in *Oḍiya* is sometimes ascribed to Tibeto-Burman influence. But on historical grounds this is improbable. The L. S. I. *Oṛiya* p. 368 notes that *Oḍiya* is in an older stage of grammatical development than classical Skt. and can only be compared with ancient Vedic Skt. It distinguishes between *e* and *ē*, *o* and *ō* unlike any other I-A. language but like Dr. It has two declensions speeched and unspeeched [130] or rational and irrational [131] and has a full set of verbal nouns. It also, except in the North, has the depalatalised sound of *c* and *j* except when preceding *e*, *i*, *ī* and *i*, *ī* respectively (resembling M. very closely in this respect), and the cerebral *ḷ*.[132] These are all Dr. characteristics (and some of them are Tibeto-Burman). Neither Bengali or Bihāri (Bhojpuri dialect) have actually the relative participle though presumably they possess the Indian type of subordinate clause. Bengali has different declensions for animate and inanimate objects (a Muṇḍa not a Dr. characteristic).[133] Assamese which language is included in the Oḍiya-Bengali-Bihari group as an I.-A. language has the Tibeto-Burman idiom of using a participle for a relative, but otherwise appears to have no further Tibeto-Burman characteristics. We are not entitled therefore to consider the characteristics of Oḍiya Tibeto-Burman rather than Dravidian.

§ 32. *Various Idioms.*

121. Some odd phrases are given below, which are found in M., G. and K. and probably in the majority of Indian languages.

---

[130] Lingam Lakmaji Practical Grammar of Odhra language 1869.

[131] L. S. I. Oriya, p. 380.

[132] Maltby, p. 2.

[133] L. S. I. Bengali, p 34.

(1) M. *gāṁv āleṁ*
G. *gāṁ āvyuṁ*
K. *ūru bantu.*

The phrases literally mean "the village came" but the true sense is "the village is close at hand."

(2) M. *vāṭ pāhaṇeṁ*
G. *rāh jovī*
K. *hāḍi noḍu.*
} with Gen.

The literal meaning "watch the road of" expresses sense of "await, expect."

(3) *Pāhaṇeṁ, jovuṁ* and *noḍu,* also mean "watch" in the sense of "to plan revenge against" "I shall see you" therefore means "I shall have my revenge."

(4) M. *āvaḍṇeṁ*
G. *gamvuṁ.*
K. *seru.*

The original meaning of the M. word appears to be "come" of the G. word "go" and of the K. word it is "enter." But they all mean "please". G. *mane gamtuṁ nathī.* I do not like it. Possibly it has some connection with the K. phrase *nanna manasige baruttade,* it comes to my mind, I like it. Of the three words the K. only now is used to express its primary meaning.

(5) M. *yeṇeṁ.*
G. *āvaḍvuṁ*
K. *baru*

Here again are words meaning originally "to come" used in another sense. The M. and K. words are in common use in the sense of "come." They also like the G. *āvaḍvuṁ* mean "to know" used impersonally for the most part. M. *malā marāṭhī boltāṁ yeteṁ,* I can speak Marathi. G. *mane Gujarātī āvaḍe che,* I know Gujarati. K. *nanage akkara baruvadilla,* I do not know my letters. The M. use is confined

to phrases with a verb as subject of the impersonal verb. *Āvaḍvuṁ* is a doublet of M. *āvaḍṇeṁ* used in another sense.

§ 33. *Conclusion.*

122. The information gathered in this article is an insufficient basis on which to found any theory. But it tallies with the supposition that the Aryan invasion was an invasion of a civilisation rather than of a nation. It appears clear that non-Aryan idioms (I do not say Dravidian although I believe them to have been almost wholly Dravidian) had a profound influence upon the spoken Sanskrit during the earliest years of the Aryans in India. This influence so changed the structure of Sanskrit that only in the earliest forms does it conform closely to the Indo-European type. Its inherent vigour was, however, immense and as India gradually became Hinduised, the respect for its ancient literature induced the development of vernacular literature on the Sanskrit model. In fact there was a Renaissance or a series of Renaissances as in Europe after the Dark Ages. If we suppose that at some time about the year 2000 B. C. there was in Persia a religious movement, which is typified in Abraham's monotheism and his flight from Ur and later culminated in Zoroaster's dualistic religion, it is possible that, like the Parsis circa 1000 A. D., a body of men escaped to the East to avoid persecution for their adherence to the cult of the old Aryan gods. The probable line of flight would be through the mountains. The flight like most religious flights would be continuous for many years, fresh refugees would every year join their fellows. The Aryan invasion would therefore compare rather with the colonisation of New England by the pilgrim fathers and the migration of the Parsis to Gujarat than a military invasion of pastoral tribes which could no longer support themselves in their country.

The Aryans intermarried with the indigenous races, until the fear of losing their racial character made it necessary for the Brahmans to enact the laws which afterwards produced the caste system. At this stage the Aryans were speaking among themselves a variety of Sanskrit with Dravidian idioms and some Dravidian words. The priests and educated nobles would know

and talk the purer Sanskrit as being nearer to the gods than the commonalty.

123. The indigenous races were attracted to the Hindu religion, which was manifestly more highly organised and more ethical than their own animistic belief, and valued the Brahmans as exponents of Hinduism. Dravidian kings invited Brahmans to their courts and gradually the Hindu religion spread. There was possibly some missionary enterprise. There is a story that the fish-eating Sarasvat Brahmans of the Konkan originally came by sea from Bengal and it appears that the Aryans after spreading down the valley of the Ganges preferred to proceed by sea rather than attempt the highlands of the Deccan. There were then two conflicting movements. One tended to extend the benefits of Hinduism to all and the other restricted the full enjoyment of its privileges to the original colour or *varṇa*, which introduced it. In very early days a supremely virtuous life would raise a man to the rank of Brahman, but later birth only could qualify and the most virtuous life would only confer the privilege of being born a Brahman in the next reincarnation. It will be seen what effect this would have on language. The priests could not allow any outside their caste to learn Sanskrit and even did not permit any but those of Aryan race to hear it recited. The spoken language had to develope on indigenous lines. Then came the inevitable reaction against the Brahman attitude. It came materially enough, not from the Dravidians, but from the Aryans, from a generous sympathy with a neglected race. Buddha and Mahavira were probably not so much the originators of Buddhism and Jainism as the inspired exponents of a long smouldering religious revolt. In religious movements the first essential is to bring the people closer to the great source and this can only be done by preaching in the vernacular. Later lest the inspired utterances be lost, the words of the preacher must be reduced to writing. Thus we find the beginnings of a vernacular literature. The next step is the publication of royal edicts in the vernacular, but the rarity of these is explained by the fact that royal ministers were ordinarily Brahmans who preferred to write in Sanskrit. Then came ballads and afterwards plays. The publication of

literature in the vernaculars would not be very extensive. The main types would be necessarily few, in spite of a large number of local dialects, as in order to make a wide appeal a compromise would be necessary. This necessity would lead to a movement of standardisation, in fact, to the construction of Grammars. And here Sanskrit, the language of the learned, would be the only model and a gradual Sanskritisation of the vernacular literature and to a smaller extent of the spoken vernacular would result. Marathi in particular, appears to have had a curious history. *Mahārāṣṭrī* as spoken over the largest area (not, be it noted, as most closely resembling Sanskrit) was taken as the representative Prakrit. It was *the* literary language. Naturally enough the spoken language drifted away from it. *Mahārāṣṭrī* did not follow, as there was no new religious revival of an anti-Brahmanic character (except, of course, in Dravidian country, on the part of the Lingayats, who separated at a date which must be left vague). The Brahmans regained their influence, eradicated Buddhism and came to a working agreement with Jainism.

124. Then came the Dark Ages before the Muslim invasions, when literature and all arts and sciences sank into obscurity. It was these invasions and the Muslim domination, no doubt, which gave birth to Gujarati and Marathi literature. Gujarati bears a distinct stamp of Islam and Marathi was assuming it. The *Sabhāsad Bakhar* written shortly after Śivāji's death is far more like Persian in vocabulary than the modern Sanskritised Marathi. Bengali has also undergone a similar process; both these movements are comparatively modern and are the product not so much of religious as of nationalising influences.

125. But in spite of the various layers and ornaments that Gujarati and Marathi have assumed, they have never lost to any great extent their syntactical form. This is a form gradually assumed by Sanskrit in the process of time and a form which Dravidian has always possessed and which is an expression of the genius of the language. All or the main part of the materials of Gujarati and Marathi are Aryan, but they are made up in Dravidian fashion and the form of a language indicates the original

speech of those who speak it more clearly than a few isolated phonemas.

(*Concluded*).

Note:—I cannot conclude without expressing my deep gratitude to Professor R. L. Turner of the School of Oriental Studies and to Dr. J. Bloch of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes for valuable criticisms and suggestions. I have adopted a number of their suggestions without acknowledgment in the text of the article not with any intention to enhance its value at the expense of others, but in order to leave the field of criticism as open to them as before.

APPENDIX.

Abbreviations and authorities quoted. The shortest form of abbreviation used is given. There are some omissions of authorities quoted only once.

A	Aryan.
Apte	Apte, Lectures on Marathi, Poona, 1922.
B. R. A. S. ..	Journal of Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society.
Beames ..	Beames, Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan language of India, 3 volumes.
Bloch	J. Bloch, La formation de la langue Marathe, Paris, 1913, and articles as quoted.
Belsare ..	Belsare, Gujarati-English Dictionary, 2nd Edition, Ahmedabad, 1904.
Caldwell ..	Cald. Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages, 3rd Edition, London, 1913.
Dr. ..	Dravidian.
Fergusson ..	Ferguson, Inge Vā Colombo, 1907.
G.	Gujarati.
G. F. B.	Gujarati First Book.
G. I. P. ..	Gujarati Infant Primer.

G. S. B., T. B. ..	Gujarati Second Book. Third Book. These books are published by the Bombay Government Education Department and are quoted by Lessons which are the same in all editions.
I. A.	Indian Antiquary.
I.-A.	Indo-Aryan.
J. A. S. B.	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
J. R. A. S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Kavyalokanam ..	Kāvyālokanam Bibliotheca Carnatica, Mysore, 1903.
Keith	Keith, Classical Sanskrit. Heritage of of India series.
Khansaheb and S. ..	Khansaheb and Sheth—Hints on the Study of Gujarati, 4th Edition, Surat, 1913.
Kher	Kher, Higher Marathi Grammar.
Kittel Dict.	Kittel, Canarese English Dictionary, Mangalore, 1894.
Kittel	Kittel, Grammar of Kanarese language, Mangalore, 1913.
K.	Kanarese.
K. F. B., etc.	Kanarese First Book, etc.
K. I. P.	Kanarese Infant Primer.
Lingam Lakhmaji ..	Lingam Lakhmaji—Practical grammar of the Odhra language.
L. S. I.	Linguistic Survey of India.
Macdonnell	Sanskrit Grammar for Students, 3rd Ed.
Macdonnell	Sanskrit Literature.
Macdonell and Keith ..	Vedic Index.
Maltby	Maltby, Practical Handbook of Oḍiya.
Molesworth	Marathi English Dictionary.
M.	Marathi.
M. F. B.	Marathi First Book, etc.

Naval.	.. Navalkar, Students' Marathi Grammar, 3rd Ed., Bombay, 1894.
Newton ..	.. Newton, Punjabi Grammar Ludhiana, 1898.
Pathak ..	.. K. B. Pathak, Kavirājamārgga Bibliotheca Karnatica, Mysore.
Payalacchi	.. Dhanapāla Pāyalacchi, Bhavnagar, 1873.
Pischel ..	.. Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen Strassburg, 1900.
Ranking ..	.. Ranking, Persian Grammar, 1911.
Ross	.. E. Denison Ross, Mabani ul Lughat, Calcutta, 1910.
Ryder ..	.. The Little Clay Cart (Mṛcchakaṭika)
Skt. ..	.. Sanskrit.
Spencer	.. Spencer, A Kanarese Grammar, Mysore, 1914.
Turner ..	.. Turner, Gujarati Phonology, J.R.A.S., July and October, 1921.
Taylor	.. Taylor, Student's Gujarati Grammar, 2nd Ed., Bombay, 1908.
Wackernagel ..	.. Altindische Grammatik, Gottingen, 1896-1905.
Woolner	.. Woolner, Introduction to Prakrit, Lahore.
Ziegler ..	.. Ziegler, Practical Key to the Canarese Language, 3rd Ed., Mangalore, 1907.

AN ISMAILI INTERPRETATION OF THE GULSHANI RAZ.

By W. Ivanow.

It is a well-known fact that many persecuted sects in Persia not rarely tried to veil their tenets by adopting the terminology of Sufism. The vagueness of the doctrine of the latter, and the difficulty of its proper formulation usually gave great opportunity to write for those initiated into the real meaning of the doctrine, while preserving the outer semblance of the highly mystic Sufic piety. There were probably also cases of a genuine " coalescence " of the Sufic ideas with those of the sect which used them for disguise. Especially complete, probably, it always was in the case of Ismailism, which is based exactly on the same Plotinian philosophy as the Sufic theories. Though Persian Ismaili literature is very little known, we may see from those works which are available that often it is very difficult to decide whether one has to deal with, so-to-say, " Ismailised Sufism " or with " Suficised Ismailism." The great extent of the practice of the *taqiyya*, or lawful precautionary concealment of one's real religion, often was carried to such a degree that in the case of some poets it is impossible to decide whether the ideas dealt with by them were really Sufic, or Ismailitic. Some of those poets and philosophers whose belonging to Sufism seems indisputable to every student of Persian or Arabic literature, are regarded by Ismailis as their own co-religionists who wrote with a great degree of concealment. For instance Sanā'ī, 'Aṭṭār, and Rūmī, who are the principal Sufic poets of Persia, are claimed to be Ismailis. We need not take up the most difficult, and probably quite hopeless task of ascertaining who is right, and may be content with the observation that in their higher and more philosophic forms the Sufic and the Ismaili ideas are exactly the same.[1] Both these systems had to adapt the Neo-Platonic theory

[1] Already Ibn Khaldūn, the famous Islamic historian (d. 808/1406), paid attention to this coincidence in the ideas, see Prolégomènes, vol. II, p. 190, and vol. III, pp. 103—106.

to the dogma of Islam by finding a compromise, and there is nothing extraordinary if both were compelled to introduce the same formulas.

Under circumstances like these it is not surprising to find that a similar claim is raised against the famous exposition of the Sufic system, the well-known versified treatise *Gulshani rāz*. It was composed in the month of Shawwāl 710 A.H. (beg. 1311 A.D.)[1], by Sa'du'd-dīn Maḥmūd Shabistarī (or Chabustarī), a Sufic philosopher of Adharbayjan, who died *circa* 720/1320.[2] The work is probably one of the most popular books on Sufism; its Manuscript copies are very common; it was often lithographed and printed in the East. A great number of commentaries on it were composed, and a great number of imitations written by different poets of Persia. Its full English translation with the original text was published in 1880, by E. Whinfield, in Trübner's Oriental Series (unfortunately, I could not find any copy of it in the Bombay libraries to give reference to it in the present paper). On the whole, the work is very incomplete and superficial, the author was badly upset by the requirements of the metre and rhyme; but the most valuable feature of the work which made it so popular and so well-known in the Muhammadan world is its conciseness, which is particularly welcome in view of the usual profusion of the Sufic writers.

Amongst some Persian Ismaili Manuscripts, which I could examine, I found a short work[3] with the title of *Ba'ḍī az ta'wīlāti Gulshani rāz*[4], which gives some Ismaili explanations of

---

[1] In some Manuscripts the date of composition is 717/1317, *cf.* H. Ethé, Gr. d. Iran. Phil., vol. II, p. 299.

[2] For an account of the author's biography, his works, and details of the *Gulshani rāz*, see E. G. Browne's Literary History of Persia, vol. III, pp. 146—150.

[3] The copy is dated 1312/1895, 28 pages of 14 lines each, 4,5 inches by 2,5, in fairly good Persian nasta'liq. It is not free from bad orthographical errors.

[4] Here the term *ta'wīl* is used in a peculiar sense which it probably acquired in Persian-speaking countries in fairly modern times. According to the earlier ideas of Ismailism, *ta'wil* can be given only by the Imam, and can refer only to the Coran and fundamental ideas of the religion, not to any ordinary book.

selected passages of the treatise, thus implying its being recognised as an Ismaili work. This, however, is not explicitly stated in the text itself. The work is not a real commentary, and is not concerned with the whole of its text. It is better to regard it as an original and independent work based on the *Gulshani rāz*.

The name of the author and the date of composition are not mentioned in the work, and there is not the slightest key to this. We may place thus the date of the composition of the work anywhere between 710/1311 and 1312/1895, which latter is the date of the present copy. The language is good Persian, without any trace of the Badakhshani or Central Asian peculiarities. The author seems to be a highly intellectual man, of good learning. All this seems to indicate that the work was not produced somewhere in the Oxus region. And yet there is a great puzzle in it, if we analyse the Ismaili terminology which we find in the author's references to the doctrinal matters. In his speculations the author continually refers to the terms like *Nāṭiq*, *Asās* and *ḥujjats* (in Plural). This terminology does not belong to the Eastern, or Nizārī branch of Ismailism as it developed in Persia, and as it is found in different authentic works of the community in question.[1]

These terms are used only in those Persian Ismaili works which continue the tradition of Nāṣiri Khusraw, and which are produced in the Oxus area, where the earlier form of Ismailism, as it was under the Fatimides, was mixed together with the more advanced forms of the Alamuti period. It continues there up till now only because of the absence of education amongst the followers of the religion which does not permit them to see the inconsistency

---

[1] In the Eastern Ismaili works instead of the term *Nāṭiq* is used *Payghambar*, *Rasūl*, etc. The term *Asās*, which is originally applied to 'Ali ibn Abī Ṭālib, to distinguish him from his descendants, the Imams (it is in reality the *Asāsu'l-imāmat*, i.e. "the foundation of Imamat") is entirely forgotten, because the doctrine recognises the equality of all Imams, amongst whom there are no greater ones, and no lesser ones. The term *ḥujjat* in the earlier Ismailism corresponds to something like a "bishop" of the Ismaili church; there were officially 24 or 12 of them. In the Eastern Ismailism the *Ḥujjat* is mostly one, and is endowed with as supernatural qualities as the Imam himself, to whom he is a subordinate.

of this mixture of the un-reformed and of the reformed systems.

As we have seen, there are no traces of the Central Asian origin of the work ; does it belong to the pen of a follower of the Western Ismaili school in Persia ? We know almost nothing about the fate of Ismailism in Persia after the fall of Alamut in 654/1256, and it is impossible to ascertain whether the followers of the Musta'lian branch were found there in the eighth c. A.H., or later, when the *Gulshani rāz* was in existence. The Western Ismaili authors, being Arabs themselves, were not in the least concerned with the matters of Ismailism in " Khorasan " (as they vaguely called Persia), even under the Fatimides, when the *Da'wat* was still united and when most vigorous propaganda was carried in the East.[1] After the fall of the Fatimides, when the centre of the Ismaili Western *da'wat* was transferred to the Yaman, and the connections with Persia completely severed, the Western Ismaili works of historical interest were completely absorbed in the petty quarrels and intrigues of local Arabs, and the stagnant life of this remote corner of the Islamic world. In the seventh volume of his great Ismaili history, the *'Uyūnu'l-akhbār*, Sayyid-nā 'Imādu'd-dīn Idrīs (d. the 19th Dhī Qa'da 872/the 10th June 1468) mentions with a feeling of surprise and great disapproval a Nizārī whom he met in Syria in 839/1435. The man was from Samarqand.

In full accordance with the spirit of the Eastern Ismaili tradition the author chiefly deals with the question of the moral perfection and the salvation in the spiritual sense, from the tortures of doubt and internal struggle. He entirely omits the philosophical and gnoceological portions of the *Gulshani rāz*, and the chapters dealing with Sufic poetical terminology. We cannot be quite sure that the work is complete in the present Manuscript ; but there are no clear indications as to its incompleteness. The author picks up isolated verses from the poem, and recombines them, often even in very short quotations. In addition to this, he sometimes quotes verses by different authors, mostly from

[1] It is remarkable that such an important phenomenon as Nāṣiri Khusraw, who left much traces even in general Persian literature, remained quite unknown to the Western Ismaili literature, in spite of his being an orthodox follower of the Fatimide doctrine.

Rūmī's *Mathnawī*, never, however, mentioning their origin. On the whole, the work is written smoothly, and indicates a considerable literary skill and theological learning of the author.

We may give here briefly the contents of the work, with a page or two in a full translation as a specimen of its style. The original verses from the *Gulshani rāz* are here initialed with GR.

The work begins with a short doxology, and then it immediately comes to the subject.[1] It firstly mentions the "primæval convenant" (*'ahdi awwalī*) between God and Man, by which the latter had to seek for spiritual wisdom and for knowledge of the Deity. Such knowledge, in accordance with the Ismaili doctrine, is possible to find only in the Perfect Man (*insāni kāmil*) (p.3). "Whoever has not seen the Perfect Man of his period of history, will for ever remain an alien; it is said (in the *ḥadīth*): Whoever has seen me, has also seen the Truth."[2] The existence of such Perfect Man is absolutely necessary to the existence of the world, and a faithful person has to take the oath of allegiance to him. "Verily, those who swear allegiance to thee do but swear allegiance to God" (Coran, XLVIII, 10). This means that those who take oath to the *ḥujjats*, swear, in fact, their allegiance to the Imam (p. 4). This point about the oath of allegiance is still carefully observed amongst the Western Ismailis. This is the Ismaili understanding of the first half of the 4th question of the GR. The second half is about the spiritual "traveller," *sālik* (p. 4). Who is the *sālik*? One who turns towards the *dā'ī*; *kāmil*, or a complete disciple, is one who turns towards the *ḥujjat*, and the gnostic, *'ārif*, is one who turns towards the Imam. The author then tells about the usual Ismaili idea about the periods of different prophets (*dawr*), explains the theory of the "letters" (*ḥurūf*) of

---

1 We may give here the initial lines of the work:
حمد و سپاس مر پادشاهیرا که آثار قدرت او بیهمتاست و ذرهٔ خاك از قدرت او گویاست، چنانکه در کلام مجید می فرماید که، قوله تعالی، وما بینهم الرحمن والدّا (؟) (سیجعل لهم الرحمن ودّا ـ ?XIX, 96) یعنی ذات من بخشنده و بخشاینده است الخ.

2 وهرکه وجود انسان کامل ندید و مشاهده نکرد که دورهٔ اوست تا ابد بیگانه باشد چنانکه فرموده است، من رآنی فقد رای الحق،

which the Universe is composed. Then he comes to the question of the *Nabī* and the *Walī* (p. 7), or the Prophet and the Saint, explaining that one is connected with the other :—

GR. Prophetship is hidden in the *Walī*,
And the *Walī* is manifest in the *Nabī*.

He, the *Walī*, knows all mysteries of the creation. The *sālik*, or *ṭālib*, has to obey his orders. By complying with his orders, and acquiring the wisdom, the *sālik* completes the ascension (what the Sufis call *'urūj*).[1] "This is not the doctrine of the transmigration of souls; this is only the manifestation of the (Divine) emanation," as the author of the GR states.

What is (the spiritual) origin of man (*bidāyat*) ?[2] (p. 8.). It is from the Truth ; and the ultimate purpose, *nihāyat*,[3] is the return (*rujū'*). The author explains that Prophetic mission is temporary and finite, *fānī*, while the *wilāyat* is continuous, *bāqī* (p. 9). The purpose is to convey the light of knowledge. *Dā'ī* receives it from the *ḥujjat*, the latter—from the Imam, and the initiate—from the *dā'ī*. Whenever the *dā'ī* reveals to him the mysteries, kept hidden from the hostile people, the morning of the real knowledge (*ma'ānī*) dawns upon him, filling him with its light, in all its gradually increasing degrees (p. 9). The author gives the outlines of the spiritual progress from the darkness (*ẓulmat*) to the Light (*nūr*). Further on (pp. 11, 12) he gives Ismaili interpretation of different Sufic symbols. The existence of spirit, *rūḥ*, i.e. conscious and active soul, is due to its capacity of knowing the Imam (p.13).

The author proceeds (p. 13) with the discussion of predestination, as mentioned in the GR, question 9 :

GR. Thou didst not exist when thy actions were created.
Thou hast been chosen for some special purpose.

This is explained by reference to the whole system of the creation. One was destined to become Muḥammad, and the other—Abu Jahl. Pp. 13—15 contain explanation of the struggle of the soul with the forces of chaos and confusion, the Gog and Magog threatening

[1] The corresponding old Ismaili term is *ma'ād*.
[2] Original Ismaili term is *mabda'*, or *ibtidā'*.
[3] Ismaili term is *intihā'*.

to overcome the order and peace, in the form of brutal passions. It is only the reason and light of religion which helps to subdue them. The meaning of the words about God's having created man after His own semblance, is exactly the presence of that Divine Light in the human nature.

The author then takes up the interpretation of the Xth question: What is the sea the shores of which are knowledge, and what is the precious matter it contains?[1] (p. 15). The sea is the nature of man, turbulent and dangerous, and the salvation-bringing shore is the religion of the Imam, bringing the Divine help, *'ināyat*, and the aim, *nihāyat*, to its existence. Light and darkness are the spirit and the matter (p. 16). In some individuals one of these elements is prevailing, in the other—the opposite, but both are inseparable (p. 17).

We may give here a complete translation of an extract which may be regarded as typical, and contains more of the author's own ideas than those of the GR[2] (p. 17).

GR. Read the *ḥadīth* "I was a hidden treasure,"
If thou wantst to know the mystery.

---

1 This particular chapter is quoted in E. Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, *loc. cit.*, from Whinfield's translation.

2 Pp. 17-19: حدیث کنت کنزاً را فرو خوان، که تا بشناسی این اسرار پنهان، یعنی انسان را دو طور است یکی طور عقل (و) دیگر طور عشق، چنانکه قرآن بدان گواه است که، قوله تعالی، والتین والزیتون، و طور سینین، و هذا البلد الامین، یعنی عشق را در صورت خاك نهاده اند و از آن کوه درخت پیدا شد، چنانکه گفته اند که درخت زیتون بالای کوه طور است، و همچنان عشق بالای عقل است، و امانی (امان) شهر از آدم است، و امانی (امان) وجود از عشق است، [18] (رباعی) گر عشق نبودی وغم عشق نبودی، چندین سخن نغز که گفتی که شنودی، گر باد نبودی سر زلفش که ربودی، رخسارهٔ معشوق بعاشق که نمودی، از این جا گفته اند که هیچ کاری بی دلیل حجت نیست از برای این که گفته اند که درخت امام است و کوه حجت، (فرد) بسان آتش اندر سنگ و آهن، نهاده از دل (است ایزد) اندر جان و در تن، یعنی همچنانکه از سنگ و آهن نور پیدا می شود که عالم و آدم از او تجلی میگردد، (فرد) چه برهم اوفتاد

This means that man has two Rocks of Sinai to ascend. One is the Rock of Reason, and the other is that of Love. Thus it is said in the Coran (XCV, 1—3): "By the fig tree! and by the olive tree! and by this safe land!" i.e., love was laid in the substance of the earth, and from that hill a tree grew up; because, as it is said, the olive tree is growing on the top of the Rock of Sinai. In this way Love grows over the Reason. The safety of the city depends on man, just like the safety of things existent depends on Love (p. 18).

> If there would be no Love and no pity of Love,
> Who should hear all these nice words which thou hast said?
> If there would be no breeze,—who should blow up the beloved's locks?
> Who should thus reveal to the lover the countenance of the beloved?

This is why it is said that nothing can be done without the guidance of the *ḥujjat*, because, as some say, the Imam is the Tree and the *ḥujjat* is the Rock.

> GR. Just like fire is hidden in stone and iron,
> Thus has God hidden (reason) in the soul and body.

آن سنگ و آهن، ز نورش گشت روشن هر دو عالم، یعنی از تربیت پیر کامل وجود و ضمیر مستجیب چنان منور و متجلی میگردد که هر دو عالم نزد او ظاهر و روشن است، و شیخ التصریح میگوید که (فرد) از آن مجموع پیدا گردد این راز، چه بشنیدی ازو با خود بپرداز، یعنی از جان و تن که جامع قرآن است سر عشق پیدا میشود که عالم و آدم منور میگردد، چنانکه اساس و ناطق و حجت و امام، چنانکه قرآن بدان گویا ست که، قوله تعالی، (و) یسألونك عن الروح قل الروح من امر ربه (ربی)، یعنی اگر سؤال کنند [19] از روح بگو روح از امر پروردگار است، چنانکه جانرا امر گفته اند، و درون جان سریست که آنرا جان جان میگویند، (نظم) سخن از جسم و جان کم گو که من بجسم جان دیدم، شدم در خلوت جانان که آنجا جان جان دیدم، یعنی عشق جان است و معشوق جانان، (فرد) توئی پس نسخهٔ نقش الهی، بخواه از خویش هر چیزی که خواهی، اما هیچ کسرا فهم این اسرار نیست، [نطق] نطق انا الحق کذین (*sic*) شد، (نظم) انا الحق کشف اسرار است مطلق، جز از حق کیست تا گوید انا الحق، الخ.

i.e. just like from stone and iron the light may come out, by which the world and the man is lit, in the same way knowledge is conveyed by the Imam and the *ḥujjat*, which enlightens the world and the man.

GR. Whenever iron and stone strike each other,
Both worlds become lit by their light.

i.e. the nature of the initiate, *mustajīb*, by receiving the education from a complete teacher (*pīri kāmil*), becomes so filled with light and clearness that every thing in both worlds becomes clear and visible to him. The *shaykhu'l-taṣrīḥ* (i.e., the author of the GR.) says therefore :—

GR. The mystery appears in the combination of both these,
So, act thyself as thou hast heard it.

i.e., from the soul and body, which is the entire Coran, the mystery of Love is apparent, enlightening the world and the man, in other words, the *Asās*, the *Nāṭiq*, the *Ḥujjat*, and the *Imām*, as is said in support of this in the Coran (XVII, 87) : "They ask thee about the spirit. Say: the spirit is from the order of my Lord." (p. 19). Soul is called *amr*, and inside the soul there is a mysterious substance which is called the soul of the soul.

Do not talk much about the difference between the soul and the body, because I saw it through the body.
(With the help of it) I travelled to the abode of souls, and saw there the soul of souls.

i.e., the Love is the soul, and the Beloved is the soul of the soul.

GR. Thus thou art a copy of the Divine design,—
Seek in thyself everything that thou wantst.

This mystery, however, is beyond the comprehension of anyone. The sense of the expression "I am the Truth" *anā'l-ḥaqq*, comes out from this.

GR. "I am the Truth" is the revelation of the absolute mystery,—
Who except God is one who should say: "I am the Truth ? etc."

The next subjects of discussion are: this and the future life, the mystical bird Simurgh, the Paradise and the Hell, Satan, etc. Adam is explained as reason, Eve as the heart, and Satan as the *nafs*, or, as it is meant here, obviously, the lower instincts. The struggle of reason with these instincts is the *jihād* (p. 20). All the religious life is thus transferred into the world of moral values. The awakening from the illusions means realisation that everything is but dream or deception (p. 21). When the *mustajīb*, or Ismaili initiate, meets with one who really possesses the knowledge, only then his eyes become opened, and he begins to understand. The only way is to cultivate one's intellectual powers (*nafsi nāṭiqa*), and then the Light shall shine upon the faithful soul, as the rays of the sun shine even upon a "rough surface of a stone" (p. 22).

GR. Before one whose soul is full of light,
The whole world is like the Book of God.

Its first *āyat* is the *'aqli kull*, etc. (p.23). Similar analogies and symbols traced through the whole system of the Universe.

The statement of the belief that man is created after the image (*ṣūrat*) of God. leads to the question: "Who am I?" thus returning to the 3rd question of the GR. The argumentation begins with the discussion of the division between "*I*" and "*thou*", which in reality is illusory. There is quite a lot of the usual speculations about the letters, dots, etc. (pp. 25—26). Ultimately it is urged to believe into the unity of all things in existence (p. 27). Again it is asked: Who is the wanderer (*musāfir*, not *sālik*)? and who is a real man (*mardi tamām*)? The reply is: He who attaches himself to the real *ḥujjat*, avoiding the futile *ḥujjat*, acting in accordance with the Coranic verse (XVIII, 107): "verily, those who believe and act aright, for them are gardens of Paradise to alight in," etc. The real "pilgrim's progress" in this sense consists of continual self-training and trying to attain the high ideals revealed in the religion.

We may add that the present text is a good example of those Ismailitic works on ethics which very closely approach the spirit of Sufism.

BOMBAY, *March* 1932.

NOTES ON MUT'A OR TEMPORARY MARRIAGE IN ISLAM

I

A BRIEF HISTORY OF MUT'A

BY DR. U. M. DAUDPOTA

Mut'a or temporary marriage is a kind of marriage, arranged between two parties, man and woman, for a fixed number of days, after which the engagement ceases *ipso facto* without any further ceremony of divorce. It is a purely personal adjustment, not requiring the intervention of the woman's kin, or the attendance of a guardian and witnesses, its chief object being not so much the establishment of a household or the begetting of children, as the providing of a man with a wife when he is away from home for military or other purposes.[1] It is called *Mut'a* or pittance, because the woman so married receives from the man a small gift either in the shape of a piece of cloth or a handful of flour or dates.[2]

The institution of this kind of marriage is of special interest inasmuch as it constitutes one of the main points of controversy between the Sunnite School of thought and that of the Ithnā 'Asharī Shi'itics, known as Twelvers. Though commonly prevalent among savage peoples,[3] it also obtained among the civilized nations like the Greeks, for instance, and found its expression in Plato's *Republic* in favour of his Guardians. It existed in pre-Islamic Arabia in unmitigated vigour, and was more or less akin to prostitution, wherefore 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb dubbed it as " the

---

1 Juynboll, *Handbuch*, p. 228.

2 *Taysīru'l-Wuṣūl* (Cairo, 1346 A.H.) Vol. IV, pp. 261-262, *vide* the traditions reported by Ibn Mas'ūd and Jābir.

3 Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage* (London 1894), chap. XXIII, pp. 517 ff.

sister of harlotry".[1] Its infiltration into Islamic Society and its final abrogation are a matter of history. Like wine, this practice, too, was gradually abolished, although it still persists among the Ithnā 'Ashariyya who defend it with all possible arguments at their command.

If we study the *Qur'ān* and the traditions impartially, we find that as long as the Prophet was in Makka, *i.e.*, before his migration to Madīna, the *Mut'a* marriage was not practised by his companions, nor was it in any manner countenanced by the Prophet. The Qur'ānic chapters revealed during the Meccan period are quite explicit on the point. Among the characteristics of true believers is also mentioned that they are "those who guard their private parts, except before their mates, or those whom their right hands possess for which surely they are not blameable; but whoever seek to go beyond that, those are the transgressors" (XXIII, 5-7; LXX, 29-31). These verses incontestably prove that only rightfully wedded wives and female slaves, either bought or captured in war, were lawful for the true believers.

At Madīna, however, things became different. The Prophet and his disciples were constantly in danger of being harassed by the powerful Quraish of Makka, who were antagonistic to the faith of Islām and the rising Muslim community. In their self-defence,

---

[1] It should be understood that in pre-Islamic or Islamic Arabia it was rarely any respectable woman that offered herself for the *Mut'a* marriage. There seems to have been a special class of women, particularly slave-girls, who lent themselves easily to strangers, and made over their earnings to their masters who kept them specially for this purpose (*vide* Lammens, *Mo'āwiya*, p. 409). The very nature of the hire given to *Mut'a* women betokens that they must belong to a lower stratum of society. The jealous Arabs could never brook this sort of infamy. Such prostitutes were found in plenty all over Arabia, especially at places noted for annual fares, such as Makka and 'Ukāz and were marked out by banners waving before their tents. Ibnu'l-Kalbī in his *Kitābu'l-Mathālib* has mentioned the names of more than ten famous women among them being Umm Mahzūl, whom one of the companions wanted to marry but was forbidden to do so by the Qu'rānic verse "As for the adulteress, none should marry her but an adulterer or a polytheist" (XXIV, 3). They were commonly known by the name of *Ṣadīqa*, a mistress. (*Vide* Alūsī's *Bulūghul-'Arab* Cairo ed., Vol. II, pp. 4-5.)

the Prophet often sent out parties of his disciples, sometimes headed by him personally, for reconnoitring in the vicinity of Madīna, and many times these came in conflict with the Quraish caravans and their troops. During these expeditions, the companions had to remain away from their homes for long periods. In countries, like Arabia, where the climate is so hot, it was extremely difficult for people like Arabs, who possessed a fiery and passionate temperament, to control the sexual instinct for any length of time. Thus 'Abdu'llāh b. Mas'ūd says: "We used to go on expeditions in the company of the Prophet, without taking our wives with us. So we represented (to him) whether we should emasculate ourselves. He prevented us from this (course) and then permitted us to resort to *Mut'a* (*thumma rakhkhaṣa lanā an-nastamta'a*). So one of us used to marry a woman for a time by giving her a piece of cloth."[1]

We may fairly infer from this that the Prophet, from the very first, was conscious of the immorality of the *Mut'a*, marriage and that he gave his reluctant permission only under exceptional circumstances. The verse generally supposed to embody the sanction of the *Mut'a* marriage is "and all (women) beside these are made lawful for you, provided that you seek (them) with your property marrying (them) without committing fornication; then as to those by (marrying) whom you profit (*fama'stamta'tum bihī minhunna*), give them their statutory gifts, and there is no blame on you about what you mutually agree after that which is stipulated" (IV, 24). Obviously, then, this verse is innocuous, and does not in any way differ from the Meccan verses already translated; nor is by "*istimtā'*" to be understood "*Mut'a*" as commonly interpreted. This is further supported by the tradition put in the mouth of Sabrah who says that in his time "*istimtā'*" meant nothing but the legal marriage (*wa'l-istimtā'u yauma'idhin 'indanā at-tazawwuj*).[2] We may therefore safely assume that the *Mut'a* marriage was not divinely sanctioned, but was conceded by the Prophet as a

1 *Taysir*, p. 216.

2 Amāli of Imām Aḥmad b. 'Isā, *vide Majmū'u'l-Fiqh* of Imām Zaid b. 'Alī b. al-Ḥusain b. 'Alī, ed. Eugenio Griffini (Milan, 1919), No. 1432, pp. 328-329.

matter of expediency, and that it did not require to be abrogated by a special revelation in the *Qur'ān*. In this connection, the last words of the tradition handed down by Sabrah are sufficiently convincing : "O people! I had indeed allowed you to benefit by these women. But behold! God has prohibited it until the day of Resurrection. So if anyone has such women, let him allow them to go their way, and do not take aught of anything you have given them ".[1]

In any case, the practice was regarded as "carrion, blood and pork" (*ka'l-maytati wa'd-dami wa'l-laḥmi'l-khinzīr*),[2] and was not resorted to except in dire need. Nevertheless, the Prophet soon became aware of its evil consequences, and forbade it on the day of Khaybar (6 A.H.), as is evident from the reproach of 'Alī to Ibn 'Abbās,[3] who in spite of the clear injunction of the Prophet, pronounced the validity of the *Mut'a* marriage. Be it as it may, *Mut'a* continued to be practised till the victory of Makka (10 A.H.) when permission was given for three days, after which, however, it was withdrawn and this form of marriage laid under an eternal interdict.[4]

The story touching the prohibition of the *Mut'a* marriage is recorded by most of the traditionists, and by Imām Zayd b. 'Alī, the founder of the Zaydite sect, almost in the same breath, and through the same chain of narration, but is rejected by the Twelvers as a later fabrication.[5] It was only those of the companions who happened to be absent on the occasion of the victory of Makka, that did not hear of this verdict of the Prophet, and continued to pronounce in favour of *Mut'a*, until 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb seeing

---

1 *Ibid*; also Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, with the commentary of Nawawī (Cairo edition), Vol. IX, p. 185.

2 Alūsī, *Tafsīr Rūḥu'l-Ma'ānī*, Vol. V, p. 5; *Majmū'u' l-Fiqh*, p. 324 notes on tradition No. 718, and Nos. 1436, 1437 and 1438.

3 *Taysīr*, Vol. IV, p. 262; *Majmū'*, p. 197, No. 618, 1420, 1422. This reprimand of 'Alī to Ibn 'Abbās cannot be reconciled with his utterance لولا ان عمر نهى عن المتعة ما زنى الا شقى (Ṭabarī's commentary, q.v.)

4 Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Vol. IX, p. 184-185, and *Majmū'*, No. 1432, pp. 328-329, the tradition handed down by Sabratu'l-Juhanī.

5 *Cf.* for instance, *Al-Fuṣūlu'l-Muhimma* by Sayyid 'Abdu'l-Ḥusayn Sharafuddīn al-Mūsavī al-'Āmilī (Ṣaida-'Irfān Press, 1347 A. H.), p. 59.

the serious complications to which it led,[1] suppressed it with a high hand, and his policy in this respect was carried on by 'Uthmān with the same rigour.[2] But Ibn 'Abbās was inexorable; he tenaciously held to the momentary concession of the Prophet contending that the *Mut'a*-sanctioning verse was never abrogated,[3] and in order to construe the sanction of *Mut'a* in the verse, he, like Ibn Mas'ūd and few others, read the phrase "*ilā ajalin musammā*" (upto a fixed term) after "*fama'stamta'tum bihī minhunna.*" The commandment of the Prophet, the severity of 'Umar and the gentle rebuke of 'Alī that he was a misguided man ("*anta rajulun tā'ihun*")[4] could not deter this Ḥabru'l-Islām from persisting in this wrong course. He would say: "*Mut'a* was naught but mercy from God, by which He showed kindness to the people of Muḥammad and had not 'Umar forbidden it, none but a wretch would have had recourse to fornication".[5] As late as the time of Ibn Zubayr who established himself at Makka as a rival Caliph to the Umayyads (61/73 A.H. =680/692 A.D.), we find him delivering his pet fatwā which, as time went on, became scandalous. Muslim records on the narration of 'Urwa b. Zubayr that once Ibn Zubayr during the course of a sermon at Makka remarked: "There are people whose hearts God has blinded, even as He has blinded their eyes, who issue fatwās for "*Mut'a,*" hinting at Ibn 'Abbās who angrily retorted, "verily, you are a hard and harsh man (*innaka la-jilfun jāfin*),

---

1 For instance, the incident of 'Amru b. Ḥurayth (*Taysīr*, IV, p. 262) and that of Rabi'a b. Umayya (*Muwaṭṭā*, Cairo edition, Vol. II, p. 12).

2 Lammens, *Mo'āwiya* p. 409.

3 There is no question of abrogation, as this verse was revealed in Madīna and could not be abrogated by the two Meccan verses already quoted.

4 Alūsi, *Tafsīr Rūḥu'l-Ma'ānī*, Vol. V, p. 6.

5 This is according to the version given by 'Ibn Rushd in his *Badāyatu'-l-Mujtahid*, Vol. 2, p. 47, although in place of 'Umar, the author writes "Muḥammad" which presumably is an error. Another variant of the tradition given by Ibnu'l-Athīr in his *An-Nihāya* runs as: فلولا نهيه عنها ما احتاج الى الزنا الا شفى under the heading *Shafan*, which means "except a few people"; also see Lane's Lexicon under the same heading.

for, by my life, *Mut'a* was being practised in the days of the Guide of the Pious (*i.e.*, the Prophet)". Thereupon Ibn Zubayr said to him: "Well, try it yourself; for by God, if you do it, I will pelt you with your stones".[1] It appears that he remained impenitent throughout, although it is said that towards the end of his life he recanted this doctrine. He is said to have confessed that "*Mut'a* prevailed only in the beginning of Islam, when a man, going to a town where he had no acquaintance, married a woman for the period he intended to stay there, so that she might guard his goods and look after his affairs".[2] It is also stated that he allowed it only in case of urgent need and travel, but people took an undue advantage of this concession. Hence al-Ḥāzimī concludes that the Prophet did not allow this concession to people while they were in their hearth and home, but allowed it only on certain occasions according to the varying needs, until at last he declared it unlawful once for all.[3]

The Sunnites, Zaydites and Ismā'īlites[4] are all agreed on the proscription of the temporary marriage, but the Shī'ites of the Ithnā 'Asharī School of thought, mainly basing their arguments on the reading of Ibn 'Abbās, which, however, is generally held to be weak and rare, up to the present day regard this kind of marriage as admissible. They argue that a divinely revealed institution could not be abrogated except by a divine revelation, and that the Qur'ānic verse above discussed was not invalidated by a later commandment. Further they assert that the sanction of *Mut'a* has been handed down to them through the incontrovertible reports of all the twelve Imāms, and hence they question the competence of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb in abolishing this marriage, for the competence to enact or to abrogate a law belongs only to

---

1 Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*—IX, p. 188: Alūsī, *ibid*, p. 6.

2 Alūsī, *ibid*, p. 6.

3 Alūsī, *Tafsir*, V. p. 6.

4 *Cf.* Mr. A. A. A. Fyzee's note on the Ismā'īlī Law which follows. Granting that the founder of the Zaydite sect was in touch with Wāṣil b. 'Atā' and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, and was therefore influenced by the Sunnite view, it is really surprising that the Ismā'īlites, who have at least Six Imāms in common with the Ithnā 'Ashariyya, do not recognize this kind of marriage.

a *Ma'ṣūm*, the Infallible Imām.[1] Accordingly, in Persia and other Shī'ite countries, such temporary unions are not uncommon. Respectable people, however, rarely contract such a marriage, but if they do so, they extend the term to ninety-nine years, thus making it the equivalent of a permanent one, and the children of such *ṣīgha* wives enjoy the rights of children by the legal marriage.[2]

II

THE ISMAILI LAW OF MUT'A

By A. A. A. Fyzee

In *JBBRAS* for 1929, N. S. Vol. V, pp. 141-145, I had published the text and translation of an Arabic extract from the most authoritative legal corpus of the Ismā'īlīs, *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām*, by Qāḍī an-Nu'mān b. Muḥammad b. Manṣūr b. Ḥaiyūn, d. 363/974, probably the most illustrious of all Ismā'īlī lawyers and known as 'the Abū Ḥanīfa of the Shī'ites.' That extract dealt with Bequests to Heirs. The extract printed below, also from the same work, deals with the question of *mut'a*, and is one further illustration of the general proposition that the Ismā'īlīs differ in many important respects from the Ithnā 'Asharīs, the 'orthodox' Shī'ites, and agree with the Sunnites[3] and the Zaidīs.[4]

The *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām* is quite clear on the point that *mut'a* is not permissible and is in effect *zinā*. The extract given below

---

1 Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam* (Heidelberg 1925), p. 229. Ma'mūn, the 'Abbasid Caliph, was in favour of reviving the *Mut'a* marriage, but he was dissuaded by Yaḥyā b. Aktham from pursuing this course, as it might arouse public indignation against him (Ibn Khallikān, *s. v.* Yaḥyā b. Aktham. Tr. de Slane, IV, 30).

2 For further particulars see R. Levy's *Sociology of Islam*, Vol. I, pp. 164-166. For *Mut'a* marriage among early Arabs, see Professor Robertson's *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (London, 1903), p. 83 *et seq.*

3 (1931) 33 *Bombay Law Reporter*, Journal, 30-32. This article contains a translation of the extract given below.

4 *Majmū'u'l-Fiqh* by Zaid b. 'Alī. Ed. Griffini, 197 1-5.

in support of the above proposition and translated by me on a former occasion, has, so far as I am aware, never been published before. Its text is based on four MSS., a detailed description of which will be given in the edition of the legal portion of the *Da'ā'im* which I am preparing. Here it will be sufficient to mention that *A* is dated 1311/1893; *B*, 1325/1907; *C* is undated, a beautiful Yemenite MS., probably 11th century A. H.; and *D* is dated 1126/1714.

The MSS. used—none other being available—are by no means ancient, and therefore no finality can be claimed for detailed accuracy in the text of the extract. Two facts may however be pointed out in its favour generally: first, I have had the opportunity of examining numerous copies of the *Da'ā'im*, dating from the 9th century of the Hijra onwards and have never found them to differ in any material particulars. The text of the work, greatly reverenced and assiduously studied to this day, seems to have been preserved with singular accuracy by the Western Ismā'īlīs. And the surprizing zeal with which they still hide it from the profane gaze of those outside the pale of the Holy Da'wat, has probably further contributed to the preservation of the text in its purity. Second, the *Da'ā'im* is continuously cited with approval by the author of *Mustadraku'l-Wasā'il wa Mustanbaṭu'l-Masā'il*,[1] Mīrzā Ḥusain b. Muḥammad at-Taqī an-Nūrī aṭ-Ṭabarsī and the *riwāyāt* there agree almost word for word with the text of the *Da'ā'im* as

[1] 3 Vols. Tehran, Vol. I, 1318/1900; II, 1319/1901; III, 1321/1903. The *Mustadrak* is a collection of traditions and is a supplement to *Wasā'ilu'sh-Shi'a* (3 Vols. Tehran, 1323/1905. Repeatedly printed in Persia. By Md. b. Ḥasan al-Ḥurr-i-Āmili.) The author of the *Mustadrak* states that he desired to collect those traditions which the author of the *Wasā'il* had omitted. See his Introduction and iii, 289. The author, according to his own note, (iii. 877) was born on 18 Shawwāl 1254/5 January 1839. The first book in volume i, *Kitābu'ṭ-Ṭahāra*, was finished in 1296/1879; from the last lines of the third volume it appears that the book was finished in A. H. 1319/A. D. 1901. The date of the death of the author is not known to me, as the book was obviously printed in his lifetime. The fact that the author of the *Mustadrak* cites *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām* so fully and accurately shows that the work exists, or at any rate existed, till recently in Persia and was known to scholars. The *Mustadrak* is therefore a further source for the establishment of the text of the *Da'ā'im*.

preserved by the Western Ismā'īlīs in India. I have compared all the *riwāyāt* in the *Kitābu'l-Waṣāyā* in the two works for writing a paper on "The Ismā'īlī Law of Wills," to be published shortly, and found that although the order in which the traditions are quoted differs in the two works, the traditions themselves do not differ materially. A curious fact, worthy of observation, is that Mīrzā Ḥusain omits all reference to the *Da'ā'im* in his chapter on *Mut'a*,[1] although he knows full well that Qāḍī an-Nu'mān is against him on this question.[2]

The *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām* consists in the main of questions addressed to the Imāms of the House of the Prophet (*ahlu'l-bait*), mostly to Ja'far as-Ṣādiq (the Veracious), and their answers to them. But the extract cited below is of interest because of its argumentative style, a style seldom employed by the author. It will be seen that it consists of three distinct parts. The author begins by reciting a a tradition of the Prophet; next he relates a saying of 'Alī, his son-in-law; and lastly, a story of Imām Ja'far is made the basis of an argument from the author's pen, the conclusion of which is that *mut'a* is *zinā* (sinful intercourse).

The language of the extract presents no special difficulty; and, as I have translated it before and have nothing to add to it at present, no useful purpose would be served by repeating the English rendering here.[3]

By way of appendix, three more extracts from hitherto unpublished Ismā'īlī texts are also given. They confirm the proposition of law laid down in the *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām*.

(i) The *Mukhtaṣaru'l-Āthār* is a legal work attributed to the author of the *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām*, Qāḍī an-Nu'mān. But from the introduction in the first volume it is apparent that its text has come down to us through the recension made by his grandson, Ḥusain

---

1 *Mustadrak*, ii, 587-595.

2 *Mustadrak*, iii, 314 $_{0}$; 318 $_{4}$ *et seq.*

3 For the sake of accuracy two minor corrections may nevertheless be suggested. The references are to (1931) 33 *Bom. Law Rep.*, Journal, p. 32.

Line 9—*delete* "those". *Read* " And who guard..."

Line 23—*for* "(from her)" *read* " (by her)."

b. 'Alī b. an-Nu'mān, who in his turn says that his father, 'Alī, had read it with his father, Qāḍī an-Nu'mān. The book consists of two volumes and follows the same classification of topics as the *Da'ā'im*, but is considerably shorter. This work is greatly esteemed and its authority is second only to that of the *Da'ā'im*. The copy I have used is undated (probably about a hundred years old) and has 396 numbered pages. This is vol. ii; vol. i. is similar in extent.

(ii) *Kitābu'l-Ḥawāshī*. This work consists of answers to questions arising from the text of *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām* attributed to some of the *du'āt* of the Yemen, whose names do not appear. Originally, it is said, they were written as glosses to the text, on the margins of different copies of the *Da'ā'im*, and were later collected together in the shape of a book. At present the *Ḥawāshī* are widely read and consulted for supplementing and interpreting the text of the *Da'ā'im*. The MS. of vol. ii before me is dated 1310 A. H. and consists of 796 pages, 5½ by 4½ inches. I have unfortunately no other information to give regarding this work.

(iii) *Kitābu'l-Iqtiṣār* of Qāḍī an-Nu'mān. The author in his introduction says that he first wrote the *Kitābu'l-Īḍāḥ*, a very large work of 3000 pages, containing religious and legal matters, and later the *Kitābu'l-Ikhbār*, a shorter work of a similar nature of about 300 pages. In both these books arguments for and against were stated at full length. In the present work he desires to deal briefly with the subject, giving the important points of law, tersely and without argument. It seems to be intended for beginners or as a handy code. The copy used by me is dated 1323/1905; and consists of two volumes of 88 and 91 pages respectively.

In concluding these brief remarks it may be added that the information regarding the *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām* and Ismā'īlī legal literature given above is obviously meagre and tentative. I have collected materials for the biography of Qāḍī an-Nu'mān, and when that is worked out and we have a full list of his works, we shall be in a better position to be more precise and definite regarding the relation of the *Da'ā'imu'l-Islām* to his other legal works.

* * * * * *

دعائم الاسلام،

الجلد الثانى، كتاب النكاح، ذكر الشروط فى النكاح.

§1. و عن رسول الله صلعم انه حرَّم نكاح المتعة.

§2. وعن علىّ عليه السلام انه قال لا نكاح الاّ بولىٍّ و شاهدَين، و ليس بالدرهمِ والدرهمين واليوم واليومين، ذٰلك شبه [1] السِّفاحِ ولا شرطَ في النكاح.

§3. وعن جعفر بن محمد صلوات الله عليه ان رجلا سأله عن نكاح المتعة، فقال صِفهُ لى فقال يلقى الرجل المرأة، فيقول ازوّجك بهذا الدرهم [2] والدرهمين وَقعةً [3] او يوما او يومين، قال هذا زِنا، وما يفعل هذا الا الفاجرُ، و بطالُ نكاح المتعة موجود فى كتاب الله عزوجل، لانه يقول سبحانه وَالذينَ هم لِفرُوجهِم حافظونَ ☆ الاّ علىٰ ازْوَاجهِم اوْ ما مَلكتْ أيمانُهمْ فانهمْ غيرِ ملومينَ ☆ فمنِ ابتغى وَرَآءَ ذٰلك فاوْلٰئكَ هم العادُونَ ☆ [4] فلم يطلق النكاح ع ج الا على زوجةٍ او ملك يمين،

---

1 *A, C,* سنة. *B and D* شبه. Cp. also *Majmū'u'l-Fiqh*, § 717.

2 *C,* الدرام.

3 *A, C, D,* وقعة. *B,* وقتاً.

4 *Qur.* 23, 5-7.

و ذَكَر الطلاق الذى تجب به [1] الفرقة بين الزوجين، و ورَّث الزوجين بعضهما من بعض، و أوْجب العدة على المطلقات، و نكاح المتعة على خلاف هذا، انما هو عند من اباحه ان يتّفقَ الرجلُ والمراءةَ [2] على مدةٍ معلومةٍ، فاذا [3] انقضت المدة بانت منه بلا طلاق، و لم تكن عليها عدة، و لم يلحق به ولدٌ إنْ كان منها، و لم تجب لها عليه نفقة، و لم يتوارثا، و هذا هو الزنا المتعارف الذى لاشك فيه.

APPENDIX I.

Mukhtaṣaru'l-Āthār.

Vol. II, *ash-shurūṭ fī'n-nikāḥ*, p. 248.

و عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و آله انه حرم نكاح المتعة، و نكاح المتعة الذى اباحه من اباحه هو فيما قالوا ان يقول الرجل للمرأة متعينى من نفسك او يقول لها اتزوجك بهذا الدرهم او الدرهمين او ماقال من ذلك وقعة واحدة او يوما او يومين او ما اتفقا عليه من المدة قالوا فاذا اتفقا على ذلك حلت له الى تمام المدة التى اتفقا عليها، فان علقت منه لم يلحق الولد به، قالوا و تبين منه بغير طلاق، و زعموا ان ليس عليها عدة و انها لاترثه ولا يرثها، و قالوا ان الاستمتاع لايجوز بالبكر و زعم بعضهم انه يجوز بذوات الازواج و هذا هو الزنا المحض الذى لا شبهة فيه

---

1 *C*, تجب فيه. *D*, تجب الفرقة.

2 *A, B, D*, الرجل والمراءة. *C*, الرجلُ المراءةَ.

3 *C*, فان.

ولا ستر عليه، [1] ولم يبح الله الفرج الا من جهتين من جهة الزوجية ومن جهة ملك اليمين لقوله عزوجل والذين هم لفروجهم حافظون الا على ازواجهم او ما ملكت ايمانهم فانهم غير ملومين فمن ابتغى ورآءَ ذٰلك فاولئك هم العادون، [2] فلو كانت هذه زوجة لم تبن بلا طلاق و بغير عدة لان الله تع يقول يا ايها النبى اذا طلقتم النساءَ فطلقوهن لعدّتهن، [3] ولكانت ترث و تورث لان الله يقول و لكم نصف ما ترك ازواجكم وقال ولهن الربع مما تركتم، [4] ولكان الولد يلحق بهما لقول رسول الله صلع الولد للفراش، واذا لم تكن زوجة ولا ملك يمين فهى محرمة، والاخبار بتحريم المتعة عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و آله يكثر عددها و لقوله لانكاح الا بولى و شاهدى العدل، والقائلون بالمتعة يزعمون انه لايعقد بولى ولا بشهود، وقد جاء عن على وابى جعفر وابى عبد الله صلوات الله عليهم انهم ابطلوا نكاح المتعة و حرموه و نهوا عنه.

APPENDIX II.

Kitābu'l-Ḥawāshī.

Vol. II, p. 390.

و منه (ابى عبد الله جعفر بن محمد ع م) و قالوا ان الاستمتاع لا يجوز بالبكر و زعم بعضهم انه يجوز بذوات الازواج و هذا هو الزنا المحض الذى لا شبهة فيه ولا ستر عليه.

---

1 See App. II which follows.

2 *Q.* 23, 5-7.

3 *Q.* 65, 1.

4 *Q.* 4, 13 and 14.

APPENDIX III.

Kitābu'l-Iqtiṣār.

Vol. II, p. 28.

الشروط في النكاح، وكل شرط ليس في كتاب الله عزوجل فليس بشرط، ولايحل نكاح المتعة ولاهبة الفرج دون سائر الرقبة ولا عاريته .

Bombay,
15 *January* 1932.

BRIEF NOTES

PAÑCAMAHĀŚABDA IN RĀJATARAṄGIṆI.

Under this caption appears a note by Mr. Padbanatha Bhattacharya in this Journal, Vol. VII, p. 487. He makes critical review of what I wrote in the Journal for 1925* on the correct interpretation of this term. In the article under reference, I considered the meaning of the term as it occurred in typical contexts in various places and in a variety of records, and offered what came out conclusively from that study as the actual meaning of the term. Pañcamahāśabda means nothing more than a band of music conferred upon an individual as an honour, the term itself actually meaning no more than music composed of the five fundamental sounds to begin with. This term with that origin, as it came into use, naturally lost the strict sense of the five sources of musical sounds, because most bands consist of only four out of the five on that basis, the human voice not being one generally. While giving me credit for a great deal of ingenuity, for which I put forward no claim whatsoever, the learned Bhattacharya comes to the conclusion that whatever may be the sense of the term elsewhere, the term Pañcamahāśabda for Kashmir had no other meaning than that of the five great offices, stating *inter alia* that the term has a different meaning in different parts of the country. I may be excused if I do not quite accept this position that a Sanskrit technical term like that should have different meanings in different parts of the country. That is not of much importance however for the present question.

Mr. Bhattacharya himself admits, or at least seems to concede, the meaning a band of music for the Dakhan; the term seems to be used over a far wider area than is ordinarily the case. I shall say nothing more about it than merely to take occasion to mention that I have since discovered authoritative literary usage for the term Pañcamahāśabda meaning a band of music and no more. In the Tamil Bhārata Veṇbā, a work of the early ninth century, the term is used familiarly as though it were a literary

---

* Vol. I. (N. S.). pp. 238-245.

commonplace in the sense of a band, and, in one place, the author even goes the length of mentioning the four sounds which constitute a band ordinarily, excluding of course, the fifth, the human voice, which certainly does not constitute a part of a band, and particularly so as this author uses the term in relation to the playing of bands in connection with armies on the field of war, where it is not likely that they had vocal music as a part of the band. This is a Tamil work composed in the style of the Sanskrit Campu, verses being interspersed with prose, and this term occurs about a dozen times in these prose passages, as if to indicate that this is about the most familiar use of the term. Passing over that, we come to the narrower question of Kashmir, and I looked forward to Mr. Bhattacharya offering evidence other than the Rājataraṅgiṇi even for Kashmir. After all, he confines himself to the three passages in which the term occurs in the fourth book of the Rājataraṅgiṇi. Of course, I pass over the gratuitous observation that I did not notice these passages on a textual question like that, as that is a matter of no consequence. After all the question has to be decided only on the three passages in book IV of the Rājataraṅgiṇi. In regard to the first passage concerning Mitraśarman, the passage amounts to more than this; *the king being* pleased with this zealous guardian of the royal dignity made him immediately "worthy of the five great sounds." The lines following, and a few others farther down regarding the same sovereign, state in an entirely independent form his administrative organization that separated five out of his eighteen departments of administration, and put them on a higher plane of importance by giving the heads of these their *usual title with the prefix Mahā*. This was probably because of the higher position given to Mitraśarman, indicated by the term Mahā-sandhi-vigraha, as a result of the unique honour already conferred. Terms like Mahā-sandhi-vigraha, Mahā-pratihāra we meet with as commonly elsewhere as in this Rājataraṅgiṇi itself, and, in this context, Mahā-sandhi-vigraha is not brought into any connection with the Pañcamahāśabda. There again Mr. Bhattacharya *seems to concede the* applicability of the sounds, which I contend is the normal sense of the term.

Before passing out of this subject, we must mention that the confirment of the honour of the band, which seems to the Bhattacharya an empty sound, is a substantial symbol of dignity, which the average human vanity does prize. Coming to the third passage, which, according to him, is the crucial passage. I am unable to follow where he states this meaning becomes impossible. The five brothers, all superseding their nephew, took over the authority and the honours of the king. The eldest Utpalaka was given the honour of king by having the Pañcamahāśabda. The younger brothers assumed various of the active duties that the king was actually discharging, a very intelligible kind of a division. It would simply mean that all the brothers having co-operated in superseding the king and bringing about the establishment of their own power, allowed the eldest brother to assume the dignities of king. The other brothers naturally distributed among themselves the work that had actually to be done. How is this less appropriate, and how is the assumption justified that the king of Kashmir retained in his hands the five chief offices of the State, which the moment the king was superseded was put into a commission and distributed among the individuals? If Mr. Bhattacharya would explain or illustrate that the kings of Kashmir held in their hands five of the eighteen departments of administration and show that these were actually distributed among the brothers, I daresay it will carry conviction. It is however distinctly stated that these five offices became so coveted that feudatories like the Shahi kings felt it an honour to hold any one of them. It is not stated that the king held all of them. It strikes us, however, that, in this passage as well, Pañcamahāśabda stands for various things, the band among them typically, symbolical of the kingly dignity, and seems quite a satisfactory and adequate explanation, and does not overthrow the sense, musical band for Pañcāmahāśabda in any manner. Of course, I for one should be very glad to accept any other significance for the term as soon as I am convinced by proof that the term has another meaning which these three passages either singly or together do actually convey, as Mr. Bhattacharya claims.

S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar.

A JAPANESE INSCRIPTION AT KANHERI

This interesting inscription in the Japanese Script—probably the only one of its kind found in India—is on the wall of the left side verandah of Cave No. 66 of the Kanheri Caves.

The inscription reads :—
" Na-m-myo-Ho-Ren-Ge-Kyo. Nam-myo-Nichi-ren-Dai-Bo-Satsa "

Translated in Sanskrit it means

" नमः सद्धर्म-पुण्डरीक-सूत्राय ।
नमो 'निचिरेण'-महाबोधिसत्त्वाय "॥

" Hail Thou Scripture of the Lotus of the True Law. Hail Thou Nichiren, the Great Bodhisatva "

Nichiren was born in Japan in the year 1235 A.D. and it is probable that during that century one of his followers might have visited India : and during his stay at Kanehri might have inscribed this inscription.

C. A. MUCHHALA.

[*Note.*—An impression of this Japanese inscription, which has been sent to us by Mr. C. A. Muchhala for publication, was shown to Rev. Ehara, a preacher of the Buddhist Nicherin Sect, Osaka, Japan, who kindly visited

the Society's Rooms for this purpose, when he was in Bombay. After an examination of the impression, the opinion expressed by him is given below.

(1) He confirmed the Japanese reading of the Inscription as given by Mr. Muchhala. It is a salutation to the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra and to the Bodhisatwa Nichiren.

(2) The upper half, which consists of ornamental letters in flourishes, is inscribed in the peculiar writing, characteristic of the Nichiren sect; while the lower half is in the ordinary every-day Japanese script, without ornamentation or flourishes.

(3) The age of the Inscription is quite modern; it does not bear any traces of antiquity. At the most it may be about 20 years old. The character of the letters of the inscription points to the same conclusion. In this connection Rev. Ehara thinks, that some twenty years ago Prof. Kyotsui Oka (of the Rissho College, Tokyo) belonging to the Nichiren sect visited India and after visiting various Buddhist shrines, had 'made' some inscriptions and inscribed sentences, not only perhaps at Kanheri, but possibly at some other places also, which he visited in the course of his tour.

(4) Before Prof. Oka, another Japanese gentleman, Bishop Asashi Nichi Myo, visited India about fifty years ago, but he does not seem to have left any inscriptions behind him, and his style of writing does not at all resemble that of the inscription.

(5) Regarding the opinion expressed by Mr. Muchhala in his note that looking to the date of Nicherin, *viz.*, 12th century, a disciple of the philosopher himself may have visited India and that the inscription may be very old. Rev. Ehara does not subscribe to this view. No doubt an immediate disciple of Nichiren, named Nichiji, intended to visit India and had travelled through Manchuria, Mongolia, and Tibet, but he is said to have perished in the jungles of Tibet before reaching India.

This inscription is published in the *Journal* in order to prevent future misunderstanding about its antiquity by visitors to the caves.—*Edrs.*]

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

An Introduction to the Study of Mahomedan Law. By Asaf A. A. Fyzee, M.A. (Cantab.), Bar-at-Law, Professor, Government Law College, Bombay. Published by Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press. pp. 44. 1931, Price Re. 1-4-0.

In attempting to place into the hands of law students of the Indian Universities an Introduction to the Study of Mahomedan Law, Mr. Asaf Fyzee has produced an invaluable brochure on the subject. An average student knows ever so little about the surroundings in which the so-called "Mahomedan Law" arose and this lack of knowledge presents to him difficulties in both understanding and interpreting it. To meet this need the author undertook this work but happily he has achieved much more.

Mr. Fyzee, being both an Orientalist and a lawyer, has acquitted himself of the task with credit. Clearing up the tangle of theories regarding the fundamentals, historical, social and religious, on which this law is based, he has succeeded in giving us a clear insight into the development of the science of jurisprudence in Islam. To a serious student of *Fiqh*, the conciseness and brevity which is a merit if the purpose of the book is kept in mind, comes as a disappointment. Creatively inspiring are some of the theories that have been touched, but something more about the *Qur'ān* and development in the third century of the Hijra would not have been amiss. The imperfect transliteration of Arabic words and names is conspicuous in a scholarly work of this kind, but this may be due to a shortcoming in the Press rather than carelessness on the part of the author.

This introduction is perhaps the first of its kind in dealing with the Shī'ite notions of law. The study of the further bifurcations of these notions giving rise to the Bohra and the Khoja schools is very interesting, and we hope that Mr. Fyzee will follow it up further.

M. B. R.

TRILOCHANA PALLAVA AND KARIKALA CHOLA. BY N. VENKATA RAMANAYYA, M.A., PH.D. Printed and Published by V. RAMASWAMY SASTRULU & SONS, 292, Esplanade, Madras, 1929.

This booklet is an attempt to show the historicity of Trilōchana Pallava and all his doings. It is regrettable that the author should have undertaken this enterprise for he has naturally not succeeded. To obtain his end he has sacrificed all rules of internal and external criticism. In spite of all the efforts of the author, the impartial reader, after reading the book, is fully convinced that Trilōchana Pallava, though originally perhaps a historical person, yet finally, as he is now presented in the Telugu tradition, becomes a purely mythological hero.

H. H.

JASAHARACARIU OF PUṢPADANTA (PUFFAYANTA ?) critically edited with introduction, etc., BY DR. P. L. VAIDYA, M.A., D. LITT. and published in the KARANJA JAIN SERIES BY THE KARANJA JAIN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, KARANJA, BERAR, INDIA, pp. 188. 1931. Price Rs. 6-8 or 10 shillings and 6 pence.

In these days when the recently discovered Apabhraṁśa literature is engaging the serious attention of Sanskrit scholars, it is but natural that scholars like Dr. P. L. Vaidya should come forward to bring out critical editions of rare Apabhraṁśa works. The literature in this language appears to be pretty vast. It seems, in the first instance, to have been cultivated by the Jain Śrāvakas who, as is evident, were not generally allowed or encouraged to study the sacred Prakrits or to write in them. It was, for a long time, the language of the masses and as such was considered as "degraded" as the very name Apabhraṣṭa suggests, by the learned Pandits of Jainism who as a rule belonged to the order of monks. It is only after the beginning of the second decade of centuries of the Christian era that the Jain monks appear to have cast off their prejudice against this language and begun to write in it. But by this time it was no more 'the language of the masses' as the Vernaculars had taken its place, and had almost become a classical

language so that the Jain monk-pandits did not consider it derogatory to handle it. Besides its inherent beauty must have appealed to them by the time.

Puṣpadanta, the author of the Yaśodharacarita, was also a layman. He lived in the 10th century A. D. at Mankhed, under the patronage of Bharata, the minister of Śubhatuṅgarāya of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty. He was the author of two or three other works written in Apabhraṁśa. He had several titles such as "Abhimānameru" and others, but "Gandharva" was surely not one of them. The name Gandharva does occur twice or thrice in the body of the work, but as has been rightly shown by the learned editor, he was merely the author of a few supplements which he added to Puṣpadanta's work at the request of his patron in Saṁ. 1365. Gandharva has clearly mentioned this fact though the passage in which it is mentioned is omitted in certain MSS. and has thus misled several scholars into the belief that Gandharva was only an appellation of our author. They were probably confirmed in this their erroneous belief owing to the existence of a Puṣpadanta, the Gandharva, author of the Śivamahimnastotra, among the Hindus. It is however, sufficiently clear that Puṣpadanta, son of Keśava, was different from Gandharva, son of Kṛṣṇa (Kanhaḍa).

Gandharva tells us (IV. 30, 13) that the portion which he added was composed in the Paddhati metre. This is true of all passages mentioned under (*b*) on page 17, except IV. 23, 24, 27 and 31. The metre of these last mentioned Kaḍavas is not Paddhati but Pādākulaka. A line in the Pādākulaka metre contains 16 Mātrās irrespective of the letters of which they are made up, while in Paddhati there are certain restrictions; cf. Hemachandra, Chandonuśāsana (N. S. P. Bombay, 1912) p. 25b, line 14 and p. 26b, line 6ff. But even here, though these restrictions are necessary according to the authors of Kavidarpaṇa (MS.), Chandahkośa (MS.) and Piṅgala (N. S. P. edition I. 102), Hemacandra distinctly says (p. 43a, line 9ff) that they are not observed in Prakrits and particularly in Apabhraṁśa (Iha refers to the Apabhraṁśa metres as he tells on p. 35a, line 16, that the metres beginning with 'Utsāha' are usually the Apabhraṁśa

metres). Puṣpadanta, on the other hand, has employed not merely the Paddhati metre for his Kaḍavas, but also the Madanāvatāra (I. 16, 17 ; II. 16, 17 ; III. 13, 27), the Vitāna (I. 10) ; the Paṅktikā (I. 13), the Bhujaṅgaprayāta (I. 18 ; IV. 17), the Citra (III. 2 ; 15), the Sragviṇī (III. 3), and the Vibhāvarī (III. 16). Of these, the Madanāvatāra alone is a Mātrāvṛtta, the others are Varṇavṛttas. For their definitions, cf. Hemacandra p. 33b, line 3 ; p. 5a, line 4 ; p. 5b, line 10 ; p. 7b, line 16 ; p. 12a, line 9 ; p. 7b, line 17 ; and p. 8a, line 17. In addition to these the author composes his Kaḍavas once in the Ṣaṭpadī (I. 15) and once in the Dvipadī (III. 1) metre. This Ṣaṭpadī has two halves, each containing three lines having a common rhyme, and respectively consisting of 10, 8 and 6 Mātrās. The Dvipadī in III. 1 consists of two lines with 28 Mātrās in each. In each line the Yati occurs after the 16th Mātrā and the usual Gaṇas employed are 4+5+5+2 ; 4+3+5. This type of Dvipadī is further generally used by the author at the beginning of each Kaḍava in the IIIrd and the IVth Sandhis (the only exceptions being IV.4 and 8) where it is of the Karpūra type and IV. 23-31 where there is no Dvipadī at all. He does not employ a Dvipadī at the beginning of the Kaḍavas in the first two Sandhis. We may even add here that the Ghattā or Dhruvaka employed by the author both at the beginning of a Sandhi and at the end of each Kaḍava is either a Ṣaṭpadī consisting of two similar halves each containing three lines, or a Dvipadī (cf. Hemacandra, p. 38a, line 13ff.). Thus the author uses the former in Sandhis I, II and IV while he employs the latter in Sandhi III. The lines in each half of the Ṣaṭpadī Ghattā in the Ist and the IVth Sandhis contain respectively 10, 8 and 13 Mātrās while those of the Ṣaṭpadī Ghattā in the IInd Sandhi contain 6, 6 and 12 Mātrās only. The lines in each half are of course rhymed. The Dvipadī Ghattā in the IIIrd Sandhi is of the Karpūra type ; each line has 28 Mātrās with the Yati noticeable at the 15th Mātrā (see Hemacandra p. 43a, line 15ff.).

In his introduction Dr. Vaidya ably discusses the MSS. material at his disposal and attempts to fix the date of the author. He also gives the story of the book and shows how popular it was among the Jainas. As a help to the understanding of the text, he gives

an exhaustive glossary and very few notes, where 'knowledge of technical terms of Jain philosophy is presumed in the reader.' The text, of course, is ably edited and all important variants noted in the footnotes. We feel indebted to Dr. Vaidya for giving us this fine edition of an important work in Apabhraṁśa Literature. One naturally expects some discussion regarding the *form* of the Apabhraṁśa contained in the Yaśodharacarita of Puṣpadanta and its probable connection with the Marathi language, more particularly so when Dr. Vaidya himself has raised the expectation (intro. p. 13, para. 2). A discussion of the metre also would have been useful. Perhaps Dr. Vaidya intends to do these things in his introduction to the 'bigger work' of Puṣpadanta (intro. p. 13). Another glossary of technical terms of Jain Religion and Philosophy would have also been most welcome since the work is not meant *only* for the students of Jain Religion and Philosophy in whom alone the knowledge of these can be legitimately 'presumed.'

H. D. V.

CODE CIVIL DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE DE CHINE. Livre I. Des Principes généraux. Livre II. Des Obligations. Livre III. Des Droits réels. Suivis des Lois de mise en vigueur. Traduits De Chinois par Ho Tchong-chan. Introduction de Foo Ping-sheung. Préface de Son Exc. Hu Han-min. Imprimerie de l'Orphelinat ZI-KA-WEI près CHANGHAI, 1930. Pp. XXX and 194.

The Yuan Legislature has followed Japan and the countries of Europe in codifying its civil laws. The volume, sent to us through the courtesy of the president of the Yuan Legislature, consists of a short introduction by M. Foo Ping-sheung, the President of the commission appointed for the codification of civil law, followed by 3 parts of the code itself, dealing respectively with General Principles, Contractual Rights and Obligations, and Rights to Property. Then follow the laws "de mise en vigueur."

Codification in China dates back from the earliest times and begins with the Tcheou-li, which was a collection of rules in the

form of a ritual, prescribing the relations of the individual to his family and to the state. These rules were revised a number of times, and in 1646 they were published under the Tsing dynasty under the title of Ta tsing lu-li. This again was re-published from time to time under the Mandchous, and finally under the title of Ta tsing hien-hien hing-lu, in 1910, its publication just preceded the fall of the Mandchou dynasty. However useful this code might have been to the China of old, the China of the 20th century found that this codified law was entirely insufficient: decisions were needed on various complicated questions, which arose from the ramifications of modern commerce and civilization and which the contact with the West introduced into China. Already in 1904 in pursuance of an Imperial edict the draft of a "Code of Commerce" was taken in hand. This code closely followed the general lines and phraseology of the Japanese and German codes of 1896. After the proclamation of the republic and the abdication of the last Mandchou Emperor, the Republican Government took up this work of giving a new code of laws to China. After a number of mushroom commissions had tried their hands at drafting, the committee which is the author of the present code was appointed on the 20th October 1928. After 2 years of strenuous work it submitted the draft to the Council of State for approval. The first three books of the Civil Code came into force from February 10, 1930.

In the code itself the influence of the writings of Dr. Sun Yat Sen is strongly felt. Many of the provisions have a democratic and socialistic bias: an attempt has been made, in the words of the writer of the introduction, "to assure a better and more equitable distribution of riches amongst individuals" (p. xxvii). For this purpose "the less fortunate elements amongst the population are protected against the excesses which they would certainly suffer if the very strict laws of right were strictly applied in all cases without distinction." Thus, article 218 provides that damages granted for breach of contract may in certain cases be reduced, if the amount of damages would seriously affect the resources of the defendant. Article 318 gives the tribunal authority to order payments by instalments by the judgment debtor. Similarly other

articles are inspired " by the same desire to protect the equitable interests of the unfortunate debtor."

These experiments in legislation are interesting. It is doubtful, however, whether by the mere enactment of such laws it is possible to protect the interests of the poorer litigants. It may well be that increasing the scope for the exercise of judicial discretion would cause only a greater strain on judicial impartiality,—perhaps not, in the unsettled China of to-day, at its best for resisting temptation to the misuse of power.

However that may be, the attempt is interesting, and it will, no doubt, be watched with the same amount of interest as all the other experiments of this unfortunate and unsettled country have been.

The book is well printed and the index is comprehensive.

S. F. B. T.

YOGA: Personal Hygiene: Scientific Yoga Series. Vol. II. By SHRI YOGENDRA. Pages 300. 1931. Post Box 481, Bombay. Price Rs. 10.

Happiness has been, and will ever be, the quest of humanity. All our sciences, knowledge, philosophy and activities are directed consciously or unconsciously towards the attainment of that goal. Long experience has now shown, that, try as you may, any amount of energy spent on the external world alone can rarely bring real happiness to the seeker who has not got a healthy body and a healthy inner man. Health is the first essential of happiness, the seeker of which has ultimately to turn to his own self for it after a long and hopeless search outside.

Hygiene, sanitation, prophylaxis, natural living and many other similar things, all aiming at better health for man, are questions of to-day; and in these days of the brotherhood of cultures, the ancient heritage of India claims that the Indian Yoga system is a scientific method of reaching the goal of happiness.

There has been a great misunderstanding in the west regarding

Yoga. By many it used to be understood to be magic, jugglery or some pseudo-supernatural trickery. During the last few years much has been done in India and abroad to dispel this erroneous conception; facilities for practical and scientific observations have become available to seekers in the field, and a number of books on the subject have been published. The present book, which is the second volume, and the first one published, out of the projected 12 volumes on Yoga, will considerably help in showing Yoga in its correct perspective. Yoga is not any magic, nor is it solely concerned with achieving states of ecstasy. According to our author, it aims at "a perfectly harmonized and well-balanced course of physical, mental, moral and spiritual culture."

The author studied Yoga practices under Paramahamsayogi Madhavdasji, for a number of years and also studied ancient Indian literature on that subject at first hand. He has started a class at Bulsar (India) for giving practical instructions in Yoga on scientific and practical lines. We learn from the preface written by Dr. Fox to this book that during a visit to America he convinced a number of medical men by his practical demonstrations in an Institute, established by him there, that a number of ailments and diseases could be cured by the methods of Yoga.

The present volume treats of personal hygiene in Yoga. The other volumes in the series will treat of the history of Yoga, mental hygiene, psycho-physiology, Yogic practice, Yoga therapeutics, synthetic Yoga, &c. When completed, the work is expected to be a good contribution to the subject in English, though the Yoga explained in the book will seem to be Yoga adapted to modern science and utilitarian thought rather than to the old orthodox Yoga. The published volume is divided into 12 chapters and gives directions as to the care of the different parts of the body and the different Yogic methods recommended to keep them fit. The methods are treated in the light of modern science and hygiene. The volume is well-illustrated, and the presentation of its subject is simple, scientific, yet popular and lucid, so as to enable any careful student to understand the subject easily.

N. K. B.

BOMBAY HISTORICAL CONGRESS: First Session, Bombay, December 1931.

From the Bombay Historical Society, we have received three pamphlets (1) A guide programme, (2) The address of Dr. S. K. Aiyangar, the President of the Congress and (3) Guide to the Historical and Archæological Exhibition arranged by the Bombay Historical Society at the time of the Congress.

The programme of the Congress was an interesting one and some important papers were read. The Exhibition impressed upon the visitors the importance of Archæology and Art in the interpretation of Indian History. The Presidential address was a survey of the progress of Indian Historical Research in general and during recent years in particular.

Every year more and more material is being made available to Historical Research Scholars, and in addition to the work of the Indian Archæologists, Antiquarians and the Government Archæological Department, a number of Societies have been founded of late and doing much work in Historical Research. A number of documents have been published privately by Government or with their help. The Peshwa Daftar, The Factory Records, the East India Company's minutes, are some of the very valuable publications. The Bombay Historical Society which has worked in co-operation with the Bombay Historical Research Institute have sponsored a number of important publications on Indian history, especially South Indian. We hope that with the increased historical sense in India and with the help of the new material that is being made available every day, our knowledge of Indian history will make rapid progress.

POURINGS OF A STRUGGLING SOUL. By R.V. SHAH. Pp. 28 and 119. Published by the Author, Sheth Mansukhbhai's Pole, Kalupur, Ahmedabad, India. Price Re. 1-8.

The reader of this volume of poems will get an idea of the working of a Hindu mind characteristic of the Vaishnavite School and a knowledge of the emotions of that mind.

TRANSLITERATION OF THE SANSKRIT AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

अ	*a*	औ	*au*	ठ	*ṭh*	भ	*bh*
आ	*ā*	क	*k*	ड	*ḍ*	म	*m*
इ	*i*	ख	*kh*	ढ	*ḍh*	य	*y*
ई	*ī*	ग	*g*	ण	*ṇ*	र	*r*
उ	*u*	घ	*gh*	त	*t*	ल	*l*
ऊ	*ū*	ङ	*ṅ*	थ	*th*	व	*v*
ऋ	*ṛ*	च	*c*	द	*d*	श	*ś*
ॠ	*ṝ*	छ	*ch*	ध	*dh*	ष	*ṣ*
ऌ	*ḷ*	ज	*j*	न	*n*	स	*s*
ए	*e*	झ	*jh*	प	*p*	ह	*h*
ऐ	*ai*	ञ	*ñ*	फ	*ph*	ळ	*ḻ*
ओ	*o*	ट	*ṭ*	ब	*b*		

ं (*Anusvāra*)	*ṁ*	× (*Jihvāmūlīya*)	*ẖ*
ँ (*Anunāsika*)	*m̐*	≍ (*Upadhmānīya*)	*ḫ*
: (*Visarga*)	*ḥ*	ऽ (*Avagraha*)	’

TRANSLITERATION OF ARABIC AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

Arabic.

ا	a	ز	z	ق	q	ـِ	i or e
ب	b	س	s	ك	k	ـُ	u or o
ت	t	ش	sh	ل	l	ـَا	ā
ث	th	ص	ṣ	م	m	ـِي	ī, e
ج	j	ض	ḍ	ن	n	ـُو	ū, o
ح	ḥ	ط	ṭ	و	w	ـَي	ai
خ	kh	ظ	ẓ	ه	h	ـَو	au
د	d	ع	ʿ	ي	y	silent t	h̤
ذ	dh	غ	gh	ء	ʾ		
ر	r	ف	f	ـَ	a		

Persian.

پ	p	چ	ch	ژ	zh	گ	g

Printed by H. W. Smith at the Times of India Press, Bombay, and published
by J. S. Tilley, Hon. Sec. for the Bombay Branch,
Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE JOURNAL

1. A paper may be offered by any Fellow or Member of the Society. Papers by Non-Members must be communicated through a Member.

2. A paper offered for publication should be completely ready as copy for press, i.e., type-written on one side of each sheet and prepared in accordance with regulations printed below, and should be sent to one of the Editors of the Journal.

3. The Editorial Committee will determine whether a paper shall be printed, and, if printed, in what form.

4. Every paper consisting of more than 10 pages of type-script or manuscript must be accompanied by a summary not exceeding 200 words in length.

5. Contributors are urgently requested to use the system of transliteration now adopted by this Society. A transliteration sheet will be appended to the first issue of the Journal for every year.

6. Titles of books cited should be given in full at the first citation; thereafter reference should be made by using only significant words in the title, but sufficiently clearly to avoid doubt or confusion. Uniformity of abbreviations must be observed throughout the paper.

7. Titles of articles in periodicals should be cited in quotation marks; the name of the periodicals will be printed in italic. The following abbreviations for the Journals of the principal Oriental Societies should be adhered to :—*Ep. Ind.*, *Ind. Ant.*, *JA.*, *JAOS.*, *JASB.*, *JBBRAS.*, *JRAS.*, *WZKM.*, *ZDMG.* Volume and pagination should be indicated as in the following example :— *ZDMG.* 27, 369 ff. (*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, volume 27, pages 369 and following).

8. The greatest possible conciseness in their papers is desired of contr[illegible] the sake of economy. Additional printer's charges [illegible]ons other than corrections of printer's errors must be born[e by] the contributor.

9. The indiscriminate use of Oriental characters along with roman being very undesirable from the points of view of both printer and reader, only longer quotations from Oriental languages will, as a rule, be printed in non-roman character.

10. Thirty off-prints of an article are supplied to each contributor free of charge. Further copies, if desired, may be obtained by giving due notice to the Secretary and on payment of a small extra charge to cover the printing expenses.